

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

## CONGRESSIONAL DEMOCRATS' POLICY TOWARD NICARAGUA

HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, I ask unanimous consent that two very interesting op-ed essays relevant to the congressional Democrats' policy toward Nicaragua be placed in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD.

Each of these articles was written by a highly-respected Washington DC lobbyist, geo-political writer and foreign policy consultant, Mr. Jim Guirard, who I am pleased to count as a personal friend.

Most interestingly, the author of these articles—who is quite literally at war with the congressional Democrats' opposition to aid to the Nicaraguan Democratic Resistance—is himself a prominent Democrat.

And, even more remarkable than that, he served for almost 20 years as administrative assistant to three distinguished Democratic committee chairmen—Chairman Ed Willis of the House Committee on Internal Security, Chairman Allen Ellender of the Senate Appropriations Committee and Chairman Russell Long's staff in 1981.

I point this out to make it plain that the messages propounded by Mr. Guirard's articles do not come from some "right-wing, narrow-gauge, reactionary, Reaganite, warmongering, anti-peace, pro-war, troglodyte" (as almost all of us Republicans are at times labeled by pseudo-liberal elements of the media) but from a good, solid, centrist, classical-liberal Democrat. He calls himself a "Harry Truman/Scoop Jackson/Russell Long/Chuck Robb Democrat" to be exact.

Mr. Guirard, who spends a great deal of time and effort in the field of geo-political language and labeling—what we call the "war of words"—is deeply concerned that his fellow-Democrats' policy of appeasement and accommodation toward Soviet and Cuban colonialism in Central America has no name—no name at all.

He points out that this misguided policy is, therefore, able to hide its true identity behind such disinformational good-guy labels as "peace" and "negotiations" and Contadora" and "Arias No. 3," and so forth. He calls these "semantic masks."

Frustrated by all of this false labeling, Jim Guirard wants to apply "a bit of truth-in-labeling," as he describes it, and call the congressional Democrats' policy toward Nicaragua "The Write-off Doctrine." In the first of his articles, he explains the rationale for this name as follows:

The "Write-off" label achieves its appropriateness and semantic accuracy in the fact that the doctrine's clear result would, indeed, be to *write off* Nicaragua (and by im-

plication, the rest of Central America) to Cuba and to the Soviet Union. It would do so by effectively terminating all further funding to the revolutionary "Contras" (the Nicaraguan counter-communists).

Then, in his second essay, Mr. Guirard suggests an alternative spelling—that of "The Wright-off Doctrine"—in deference to the untiring efforts in behalf of this doctrine by House Speaker Jim Wright. He explains:

Some thought was given to naming this isolationist-pacifist policy after House Speaker Jim Wright: "The Wright-Off Doctrine." But there was still hope that the Texas Democrat might desert the pseudo-liberal "left" wing of his party and join those seeking to liberate Nicaragua from Soviet and Cuban colonialism.

For a fleeting instant, Wright did seem to tilt away from his "write-off" colleagues. He even proposed—jointly with President Reagan, no less!—a plan which, while seriously defective, placed at least some real pressure for reform on Nicaragua's "Stalinista" dictatorship.

But, almost immediately, the Speaker ruled his own plan out of order, in favor of the far weaker "Arias Plan no. 3." The designation "no. 3" for this proposal by Costa Rican President Oscar Arias is, incidentally, the result of its having been twice rewritten to satisfy Nicaraguan and Cuban objections.

Mr. Speaker, without repeating all of the fascinating observations and cogent arguments of Mr. Guirard's essays, I offer them for printing in the RECORD at this point of my remarks.

I urge my colleagues to study them carefully—particularly the stark contrast in mentality and in foreign policy outlook which exists between this new "Write-off Doctrine" and the major foreign policy doctrines toward Latin America (and toward communism) which have preceded it—namely, the Monroe Doctrine, the Roosevelt doctrine, the Truman doctrine, the Kennedy doctrine and the Reagan doctrine.

All of these earlier doctrines (three of them bearing the names of Democrats, plus the halloved name of James Monroe) say basically the same thing. All of them are, therefore, in equally sharp conflict with the "Write-off/Wright-off" approach to dealing with rampant Soviet and Cuban colonialism in this hemisphere and throughout the world.

[From the Washington Times, July 15, 1987]

## CALL IT THE WRITE-OFF DOCTRINE

(Jim Guirard Jr.)

As we thumb through the lexicon of geopolitics, a major new label seems desperately needed with respect to what is going on in Congress relative to Nicaragua.

At present, there is the well-known "Reagan Doctrine," which proposes that we somehow liberate Nicaragua from Soviet and Cuban colonialism and repression. But, to date, there is no proper label for the opposing doctrine—the anti-liberation doctrine—of those who disagree with

the president and with those in Congress who support him.

For lack of any name at all, these isolationist/pacifist policies of the majority of congressional Democrats (and a handful of Republicans) have been able to travel the country and the world under such sweet-smelling labels as "peace" and "negotiations" and "dialogue" and "Contadora."

Now, however, a highly appropriate name is finally being affixed to such policies by the pro-liberation forces in Congress. The chosen name is "the Write-Off Doctrine." An alternative spelling of "Wright-Off" (a back-handed reference to House Speaker Jim Wright, Texas Democrat) was not selected because of a feeling of some that Mr. Wright will finally reject the doctrine and should not, at least now, be burdened with its nasty image of isolationism and appeasement.

The "Write-Off" label achieves its appropriateness and semantic accuracy in the fact that the doctrine's clear result would, indeed, be to *write off* Nicaragua (and, by implication, the rest of Central America) to Cuba and to the Soviet Union. It would do so by effectively terminating all further funding to the revolutionary "Contras" (the Nicaraguan counter-communists).

First legislated in several versions of the infamous "Boland amendment," the doctrine's most recent incarnation took the form of House Joint Resolution 175, which some weeks ago passed the House of Representatives 230-196. (The similar provisions of S.J. Res. 81 were narrowly defeated in the Senate, 52-48.)

Only upon fulfillment of the absolutely unachievable accounting requirements of H.J. Res. 175 might the Write-Off Doctrine's proposed funding moratorium be lifted. Under its provisions, all 1985 and subsequent monies (public, private, and foreign) appropriated, sought after or even "encouraged" by any government official must be "fully and adequately" accounted for—short of which the Write-off moratorium would remain forever in effect.

Another cynical element of H.J. Res. 175 was that it would not matter whether the funds in question were "actually received by the democratic resistance." In effect, a series of impossible conditions-precedent were sought, in order that the proposed moratorium might continue indefinitely. Clever?

"Maybe not so clever," say those congressmen and senators who are now drawing invidious comparisons between the Write-off Doctrine and various earlier doctrines by which a long succession of American presidents have attempted to keep European colonialism—and, in recent decades, Soviet colonialism—out of the Western Hemisphere.

Notice how the earlier presidential statements (based on concepts of individual liberty and of national independence) contrast like night and day with the Write-off Doctrine's total reliance on punctilious accounting procedures as its standard for deciding the fate of Central America:

Monroe Doctrine: "... the American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and main-

● This "bullet" symbol identifies statements or insertions which are not spoken by a Member of the Senate on the floor.

Matter set in this typeface indicates words inserted or appended, rather than spoken, by a Member of the House on the floor.

tain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Roosevelt Corollary to the Monroe Doctrine: "... the adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however reluctantly, in flagrant cases of wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power."

Truman Doctrine: "... I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free peoples who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

Kennedy Doctrine: "... Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

Reagan Doctrine: "... We must not break faith with those who are risking their lives—on every continent from Afghanistan to Nicaragua—to defy Soviet-supported aggression and secure rights which have been ours from birth."

Write-off Doctrine: H.J. Res. 175 would impose a never-ending "... moratorium on additional assistance for the Nicaraguan democratic resistance until ... the Congress has determined, by enacting of a joint resolution ... that the president has fully and adequately accounted for

(1) any proceeds from the sales to Iran of military equipment provided by the United States ... regardless of whether the assistance was received by the resistance;

(2) the \$27 million that was appropriated (in 1985) for 'humanitarian assistance' ... and

(3) any assistance ... regardless of whether the assistance was received by the resistance ... that was encouraged by ... the government or any officer or employee of the government."

At this juncture, no one is certain what the next incarnation of the Write-off-Doctrine will look like. One can only be certain that its newest mutation will once again be clucking pseudo-liberal sounds of withdrawal, abandonment, appeasement and surrender.

Completely absent from its vocabulary will be the principled sounds of such classical-liberals as Monroe, Roosevelt, Truman and Kennedy—men who understood well the threat of "colonization by European powers," who recognized the periodic need of "an international police power," who believed that America must "support free peoples who are resisting subjugation," and who were prepared to "pay any price, bear any burden ... to assure the survival and success of liberty."

The question now is whether centrist and classical-liberal Democrats in Congress will continue collaborating with their "left" and pseudo-liberal colleagues who propose to write off Nicaragua to the Stalinists. Or will they begin coming to their democratic good senses and vote to write off the Write-off Doctrine, instead?

[From the Wanderer, Sept. 10, 1987]

#### BEWARE THE SOVIET "PEACE" PLAN FOR NICARAGUA

(By Jim Guirard, Jr.)

Recently, this writer proposed that the then-nameless policy of most congressional Democrats toward Nicaragua be labeled "The Write-Off Doctrine" (The Wanderer, July 23rd, 1987, p. 5)—since it would inevitably write-off that country to the Soviet

Empire. The name is gradually catching on, simply because it is true.

Some thought was given to naming this isolationist-pacifist policy after House Speaker Jim Wright: "The Wright-Off Doctrine." But there was still hope that the Texas Democrat might desert the pseudo-liberal "left" wing of this party and join those seeking to liberate Nicaragua from Soviet and Cuban colonialism.

For a fleeting instant, Wright did seem to tilt away from his "write-off" colleagues. He even proposed—jointly with President Reagan, no less!—a plan which, while seriously defective, placed at least some real pressure for reform on Nicaragua's "Stalinista" dictatorship.

But, almost immediately, the Speaker ruled his own plan out of order, in favor of the far weaker "Arias Plan no. 3." The designation "no. 3" for this proposal by Costa Rican President Oscar Arias is, incidentally, the result of its having been twice rewritten to satisfy Nicaraguan and Cuban objections.

So where does this leave President Reagan, who set aside his own liberation doctrine to accommodate Speaker Wright? In limbo, halfway between the now defunct Wright-Reagan plan and the retrograde Arias-Wright plan—endorsed now by none other than Fidel Castro!

Bluntly speaking, it leaves the President's "keester" fully exposed to those in Congress and in the media whose wishful thinking and whose appetite for surrender do, indeed, promise to abandon Nicaragua to Castroite tyranny.

But there is a way out. Now that the Speaker and his band of "Wright-wingers" (Congressmen Bonior, Coelho, Alexander, et al.) have unilaterally abandoned Wright-Reagan, the President should do the same. Certainly, he should not feel bound by any associated "agreements and understandings"—such as not to lambaste congressional Democrats, not to vilify the Stalinists, and not to seek more freedom-fighter aid before Sept. 30th—when those to whom he made such commitments have long ago jumped ship.

Instead, the President must clear the cobwebs of appeasement and retreat from his mind and reactivate those powerful "doctrines" through which a long succession of American Presidents—and Congresses—have fought to keep European colonialism, and particularly Communist colonialism, out of the Western Hemisphere:

Monroe Doctrine: "... The American continents, by the free and independent condition which they have assumed and maintain, are henceforth not to be considered as subjects for future colonization by any European powers."

Roosevelt Doctrine: "... The adherence of the United States to the Monroe Doctrine may force the United States, however, reluctantly, in flagrant cases of wrongdoing or impotence, to the exercise of an international police power."

Truman Doctrine: "... I believe that it must be the policy of the United States to support free people who are resisting attempted subjugation by armed minorities or by outside pressures."

Kennedy Doctrine: "... Let every nation know, whether it wishes us well or ill, that we shall pay any price, bear any burden, meet any hardship, support any friend, oppose any foe to assure the survival and the success of liberty."

The Reagan version of these policies (all authored by "classical-liberal" Democrats, as contrasted to today's patently pseudo-lib-

eral ones) was at one time very clearly stated:

Reagan Doctrine: "We must not break faith with those who are risking their lives—on every continent, from Afghanistan to Nicaragua—to defy Soviet-supported aggression and secure rights which have been ours from birth."

That highly principled statement, however, was made when "Reagan was Reagan"—before certain "pragmatist" advisers led him away from himself and into the camp of those who speak incessantly of "peace" but who become highly uncooperative when they hear someone insisting on freedom and liberty as well.

Before his presidential terms are too far gone to permit him to help liberate Nicaragua, Ronald Reagan must recognize what normally results from the "peace plans" he is currently embracing and "welcoming." Almost without exception they produce something more correctly spelled p-i-e-c-e—the tragic write-off of yet another piece of the planet and another piece of humanity to the Soviet Empire.

## THE WITHERING OF THE UNITED STATES AT THE U.N.?

HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to bring to the attention of my colleagues a disturbing phenomenon taking place at the U.N. Or to be more accurate, to the United States presence at the U.N. In the article that I ask to be printed below, former Assistant Secretary of State for International Organizations, Alan Keyes, makes a convincing case that many of the gains the United States made in the U.N. in the early eighties are now on the fast track toward disaster. I agree with Mr. Keyes' assessment, however, I disagree that Vice-President Bush is the solution.

It is easy to remember the days when the U.N. was little more than an open forum for Third World countries to bash the United States and its allies. Not coincidentally, at that time, Congress was never more skeptical about United States involvement in that institution.

There is sad irony in the scenario created by Mr. Keyes. The State Department, the U.S. agency with the greatest interest in maintaining a strong American presence at the U.N., may end up being responsible for the demise of that presence and for engendering ill will toward the U.N. on Capitol Hill.

[From the Washington Post, Jan. 21, 1988]

### AMERICA'S U.N. POLICY: LAPSE OR COLLAPSE?

(By Alan L. Keyes)

On Jan. 5 the U.S. representative at the United States Security Council joined in a polemical assault on Israel at a vulnerable moment. He voted for an unbalanced resolution, which in effect condemned Israel's deportation of nine Palestinians suspected of masterminding many of the demonstrations on the West Bank. Some may see this as an isolated lapse in America's stance at the U.N., but in fact it is part of a pattern.

Principled opposition to the use of the Security Council as an anti-Israeli bludgeon



has lapsed. Insistence on permanent, institutional reform of the U.N.'s management and decision-making processes has lapsed. Discriminating use of U.S. funds to support international organizations favorable to U.S. interests has lapsed. The hard-won capacity to push successfully for important U.S. initiatives has lapsed.

Do all these lapses add up to a collapse? Has the administration abandoned the principled, effective U.S. stance developed at the U.N. during the early Reagan years?

There is reason to be concerned that such a collapse is in progress. Officials at the State Department are eager to prove that the United States has relented from its past hard-line opposition to abuses and anti-American bias in the United Nations. Even before Congress completed work on the FY '88 spending bills, Deputy Secretary of State John Whitehead had decided to reopen the funding spigots for the U.N. in New York. He did so without regard for the effect it would have on organizations more critical to, and favorable toward, U.S. interests. These moves send a clear signal to the officials and delegates in New York: they can safely continue with business as usual. They will.

According to the authorization language recently passed by Congress, before turning over the \$44 million balance of the U.S. contribution to the U.N. for 1987, the administration must certify that the organization has implemented the decision-making and administrative reforms adopted at the General Assembly in 1986 and made progress toward limiting abuses, particularly by the Soviet Union, of the U.N. system's personnel procedures. Third World delegates at the latest General Assembly session adamantly resisted implementation of the critical component of the reforms, which gave the United States and other major donors more say in decisions affecting the use of the U.N.'s resources. Instead, the assembly voted to enlarge the membership of the key program-budget committee, making it too unwieldy to be effective. Though the United States voted against the move, neither the State Department nor the U.S. mission at the U.N. did anything effective to oppose it.

Now a plan is being considered to issue the required certification based on the easily reversible personnel shuffling the U.N. has been doing for the past year. Officials at the U.S. mission joined in a post-General Assembly media boomlet characterizing these administrative moves as part of an era of resurgence for the U.N. They did so despite the fact that, according to preliminary tallies, the United States took its worst beating in years in the voting at the 42nd General Assembly. Even though the U.S. delegation took weaker stands (fewer U.S. "no" votes, more abstentions), even though it did not push hard for any potentially difficult U.S. proposals, even though it gave the U.N. \$100 million before any results were in, the outcome indicates a significant decline in the number of states voting with the United States.

At this year's General Assembly not a single U.S.-initiated resolution met with any success. We seem to be returning to the days when U.S. leadership on a resolution meant automatic failure. Congress asked for effective action against the abuse of "secondment," a procedure that allows member states to place their nationals in U.N. positions on a temporary basis. (Some states abuse the procedure to guarantee continued control over their nationals. Roughly 90 percent of Soviet nationals at the U.N. serve

on such terms.) This year the United States introduced a relatively mild resolution on the secondment issue. It alluded to the recommendation of the High Level Experts Group (the G-18) that secondment be limited to no more than 50 percent of any state's nationals in the U.N. Secretariat.

Even in this weak form, the initiative died in "informal consultations," without reaching the floor of the General Assembly's budget and management (fifth) committee. U.S. initiatives in the second and third committees (on capital formation and free elections respectively) met with similar fates. The only success registered at the assembly was the virtual absence of anti-U.S. name-calling in resolutions—the effect of several years of firm insistence on a principled position.

The White House has announced that Ambassador Richard Williamson, formerly the U.S. representative to the U.N. Organizations in Vienna, is the president's choice to take over the international organizations bureau. With the right backing, Williamson has the ability and experience to preserve at least some part of the achievements of the early Reagan years. But high-level policy officials at the State Department, working with the U.S. mission in New York, are pushing for premature certification on U.N. reform. If they succeed, they will preempt Williamson's authority and further damage the administration's faded credibility on U.N. issues. Williamson may not be confirmed until well into February, by which time the damage could be irreversible.

Many who worked hard to restore America's influence in the U.N. are appalled by the abandonment of the firm, principled, energetic approach that made it possible to do so. One hope remains. U.N. experience features prominently on the resumé of Vice President George Bush. The U.S. resurgence at the U.N. did not take place during his tenure there, but he has an opportunity to step in and prevent complete surrender of the gains made in recent years. Whether as a sitting administration official or as a presidential candidate, Bush should make clear now that he is not prepared to abandon the fight to restore America's influence in international forums.

### MEDIA DISTORTIONS OF ISRAEL AND NEW HOPES FOR PEACE IN THE MIDDLE EAST

HON. DON BONKER

OF WASHINGTON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. BONKER. Mr. Speaker, the violence that has taken place in the Israeli-occupied West Bank and Gaza Strip over the past 2 months has been deeply disturbing to all Americans. Equally disturbing, however, has been the way in which the media has distorted the tragedy of these events. Although the Israeli Government responded quickly and positively to international concern about an "iron fist" policy, some in the media persisted in highlighting incendiary events. Such lopsided presentations only serve to fan the flames of emotion and obfuscate thoughtful approaches to resolving the problems there. Especially objectionable to me was the parallel ABC News attempted to draw between the situation in the Middle East and Israel's activi-

ties and the situation in South Africa. As Mort Zuckerman argues in the article I wish to submit for the RECORD from the February 1, 1988, U.S. News & World Report, not only are such comparisons unjust and unfair, but they ignore present realities and the history of this strife-torn region.

At a Foreign Affairs Committee breakfast I attended with Secretary Shultz just yesterday, the Secretary offered us some instructive words about the stalled peace process in the Middle East. He observed that the key players have been preoccupied with procedure more than substance, and that the United States and its partners in the peace process must refocus their attention on dealing with the concrete problems, such as that posed by the Palestinians.

In his testimony to the committee following the breakfast, Secretary Shultz outlined the new emphasis on short shuttle diplomacy that the administration hopes will avoid the impasse between the insistence Jordan's King Hussein places on an international conference and Israel's preference for bilateral talks with Jordan.

It is my sincere hope that the administration's renewed emphasis on the peace process and its new plan for shuttle diplomacy will enable all the parties to move on to issues of substance and help bring an end now to the needless bloodshed and agony of the people of Israel and the Palestinians.

[From U.S. News and World Report, Feb. 1, 1988]

### TV'S INCOMPLETE PICTURE

(By Mortimer B. Zuckerman)

Television loves action. It is focusing often these days on the action in Gaza and the West Bank. When Israeli soldiers swing clubs among rioters, TV news gets a lot of what it likes best—great moments. They shock the viewer; they compel attention. When action is the essence of the story, as it is most simply in something like a sports event or an earthquake, the moments can add up to a truth. In the West Bank and Gaza riots, the moments have added up to a lie.

Television has polluted the public debate because it is inherently difficult for pictures to give context, history and meaning to events. It is asking too much for pictures in a half-hour news program to summarize 40 years of the history of Israel, or the history since 1967 or since the Yom Kippur War, or even the history that forced Israel to occupy the West Bank and Gaza. Words are necessary. The disturbing feature of the TV reporting of the West Bank and Gaza is not only that the words have been inadequate; some of them have been inflammatory. They have compounded the lie.

I refer in particular to the reporting by ABC television last month and its comparison of the Gaza uprising to riots in South Africa, suggesting an odious moral equivalency between the two. There is a superficial resemblance in Israeli soldiers swinging clubs and South African police swinging clubs, between disenfranchised blacks and West Bank Arabs without full political rights in their own land. But these are facile comparisons. It is the job of journalism to take such comparisons as a starting point, not a conclusion. And the conclusions in comparing Israel and South Africa are dra-

matically different in substance from those that have been suggested by the TV images.

Israel is an open democracy, the only one in the Middle East, and it is being made to suffer for that. Even though the TV pictures are doing it damage in world public opinion, it has not closed its borders, deported journalists and imposed the kind of censorship South Africa has imposed.

For ABC to compare the Arabs of Gaza and the West Bank to blacks in South Africa is not only unfair but ignores history and reality. The blacks in South Africa are an overwhelming majority whose rights are denied. By contrast, the Arabs within Israel have full political and civil rights. (The exception: They cannot serve in the Israeli military.) It is only the Arabs in Gaza and the West Bank who lack these rights, because they are subjects of a military occupation as the result of a war in which the Arabs tried to destroy the very state of Israel. It is because of this threat to Israel that Israel must curtail their political rights. By contrast, the blacks want to be full partners in South Africa. In South Africa, the white government refuses to negotiate with the blacks; in the West Bank, it's the Arabs who refuse to negotiate directly with Israel. The blacks are oppressed because of the color of their skin; Zionism rejects racial superiority and indeed was founded in response to discrimination in the West. The blacks in South Africa have not stated their intention to drive the whites into the sea; the PLO leadership has proposed such an end for the Jews. Unlike the South African blacks, the Arabs of Gaza and the West Bank have an alternative. They suffer—and no one denies that they suffer—because they and their leaders have made a choice. This is the crux of the matter, and it requires spelling out a little.

The choice they have made is not to live in peace with Israel. They want the Jewish state to disappear, whatever its boundaries. A recent poll of the Palestinians in the West Bank by *Al Fajr* found 17 percent of the inhabitants favored the establishment of a Palestinian state in the West Bank and Gaza Strip—but 78 percent wanted a Palestinian state in what is now Israel. In their more conciliatory public statements, the PLO leaders now reject the idea of driving the Jews into the sea and would permit the Jews some kind of role in a future "secular and democratic Palestine." But in their charter, in their writings and in their speeches, their demands are not only for the areas Israel conquered in the war of 1967 but for the end—and often the violent end—of Israel as a political entity.

Both the PLO and its more extremist wings have taken or threatened to take the lives of Palestinians who want to negotiate. Today's TV images do not recall the 1983 assassination of Issam Sartawi, a PLO member and leading advocate of reconciliation with Israel, whose murder by extremist Palestinians became symbolic of the systematic assassination of conciliatory Palestinians.

So what the Palestinians have is a political leadership in the PLO that has consistently blocked any attempts at peace with Israel since 1948, when the Arab states refused to accept the United Nations plan for the partitioning of Palestine. Intransigence continued up to 1967, when Israel pleaded with Jordan's Hussein not to enter the fighting. After the 1967 War, Israel was prepared to give back the West Bank and Gaza for peace. The war was in June; in September, the Arab states met in Khartoum and

issued the famous three "Noes": "No peace, no recognition and no negotiation" with Israel. To this day, the Arab leadership continues to be unwilling to talk directly with Israel or to risk the realistic political compromise that would relieve the lot of the Palestinian people. Israel is forced to rule over the Arabs largely because these Arabs have left no other choice.

It is easy enough to say there is a simple choice: That Israel should walk away from the occupied territories in the hope that this gesture would produce enough Arab good will for peace. History and geography counsel against such a gamble. There is a greater likelihood that Arab extremists would use these territories as a terrorist base that would ultimately constitute a threat to Israel's very existence. Look at the map, as the Israeli soldiers say. To drive from the Jordan River of the West Bank to Tel Aviv on the Mediterranean takes about 90 minutes. If Israel abandoned the West Bank, a Jordanian or Palestinian Army would be about 10 miles from Tel Aviv—as close as Bethesda, MD., is to the White House. Even if the West Bank were demilitarized like the Sinai, an Arab army could cross the river in the afternoon and control the ridges overlooking Tel Aviv by the same evening, well before Israel's citizen Army would have time to mobilize. The unacceptable risk is that this territory could be a source of destabilization not only for Israel but even for Jordan itself. Jordan, being 60 percent Palestinian, would be threatened by a militantly Palestinian West Bank—a threat King Hussein is known to recognize.

No wonder Israel argues against the simple idea of exchanging territory for peace. The reality is that Israel will stay on the West Bank for a long time even though its presence there will continue to be challenged. Many Israelis and others view that prospect with grave misgivings. Violence will continue at some level, though probably not the kind of unrelenting civil war some predict. But whatever the problems and tensions, they can be endured because the real alternatives are worse.

It is necessary for statesmen, and especially the Arabs, to focus less on the future of the occupied territories and more on the future of the Arab inhabitants. During the years when Moshe Dayan was Minister of Defense in Israel, there was a policy of minimal Israeli intervention in Arab domestic matters that included the avoidance of provocation and the attempt to improve the standard of living. On balance, life measured in health, incomes, and education has improved for the Arabs in the West Bank and Gaza compared with that of their fathers and grandfathers. Teddy Kollek, as mayor of Jerusalem, has demonstrated how a potentially hostile Arab population can be treated with respect and political skill, making it possible for this city to work for both Arabs and Jews—in ways utterly inconceivable in South Africa.

Israel should not be discouraged or panicked by reaction to the Gaza riots. Israel should continue quiet, confidential relations with Jordan in what has been called an "adversarial partnership," wherein both parties encourage the West Bank's residents to accept their status as Jordanian subjects in all civil matters, leaving the security issues of the territory under Israel's military control. Only in this way can Israel, Jordan and the West Bank Palestinians be assured that PLO extremists will not make the West Bank their home base and turn the West Bank into another Beirut. Until there is a

fundamental transformation of the political and ethnic hatreds in this area, this is the best hope among many lesser alternatives.

The question is not one of instant solution. There is none. To talk of one is to encourage expectations that can only be dashed by the historic enmities of that tragic region. The tragedy of glib comparisons to South Africa is that they incite the resentments of the viewers and stimulate the false hopes that there are simple solutions.

## UPGRADE THE VETERANS' ADMINISTRATION TO A CABINET LEVEL DEPARTMENT

HON. GERALD B.H. SOLOMON

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SOLOMON. Mr. Speaker, on January 14, 1988, the Wall Street Journal printed a letter by Congressman BEILENSEN expressing his opposition to upgrading the Veterans' Administration to a Cabinet-level department. I take strong exception to the letter.

Congressman BEILENSEN believes the Cabinet should be reserved for policy formulation that really needs the President's attention. On this one point we agree, and I am very pleased President Reagan has determined that the head of our Nation's veterans' programs should be in the Cabinet to help set national policy.

Today, I am submitting into the RECORD a statement by Charles Joeckel, executive director of the Disabled American Veterans, which was printed in the February issue of the DAV Magazine.

VETERANS: CAN WE DO LESS?

(By Charles E. Joeckel, Jr.)

Some people in Washington are capable of writing eloquent, seemingly rational arguments for throwing infants from the tops of buildings. After working in this city for many years, I'm no longer surprised to see high-flown rhetoric placed at the disposal of the most wretched, conscience-cutting propositions.

I've seen several "modest proposals" for America's veterans among those propositions since a land mine explosion took both my legs in Vietnam. The latest was "Veterans: More Than Their Due," written by Congressman Anthony C. Beilenson (D-Calif.) for the Jan. 14 Wall Street Journal. It is printed in its entirety beginning on the facing page.

Mr. Beilenson danced a beautiful rhetorical waltz, including many phrases of empty sympathy for disabled veterans, in his vicious attack on just about every veterans' program that exists.

But then, could we look for more understanding of the hardships of military life from a man who's never worn a uniform?

Could we hope for a less elitist attitude from someone with two degrees from Harvard?

Could we expect more empathy for a largely working class group of people from a Congressman whose district includes Beverly Hills and West Hollywood?

I don't ask these questions to launch a personal attack. I do so to point out the gulf



that yawns between Mr. Beilenson's life and the lives of most veterans.

Very few disabled veterans go into the job market holding the golden key of a Harvard education. Most went into the Armed Forces with a public high school education; for many, through no fault of their own, that was the end of the line.

Very few have homes in an area like Beverly Hills or West Hollywood, possibly the swankiest neighborhoods in America. Most veterans feel fortunate to use their VA-insured mortgage to buy a modest house in an ordinary working class neighborhood.

And, having never served in the Armed Forces, Mr. Beilenson seems to believe a tour of military duty is much like any other job. Obviously, getting shot at in a war isn't like any other job in the civilian economy, not a legal one anyway. And Mr. Beilenson should spend a week on the deck of a destroyer in the Persian Gulf if he thinks "peacetime" duty is such a treat.

Compared to just about any disabled veteran I've ever met, Mr. Beilenson has led a charmed life. He's wrong to judge the needs of America's veterans against the opportunities and outright gifts that life has bestowed upon him. He should recognize this fact if he wishes to speak with authority on veterans' programs.

He should also recognize that the advantages he's enjoyed in his life—blessings granted to a select few—come at a cost that's been paid by others. The economic and political systems that create those advantages would not exist if it weren't for America's veterans, and it seems to me that Mr. Beilenson's attitude lacks gratitude.

I'd like to discuss the points Mr. Beilenson's *Wall Street Journal* piece brought up in his argument against Cabinet-level status for the VA. But really there's only one. "A position in the president's cabinet," he says, "should be reserved for heads of departments who formulate policy in areas that really do need the president's attention."

Perhaps, if Mr. Beilenson felt veterans' programs were an area that really does need a U.S. Congressman's attention, he wouldn't have had so many uninformed things to say in his wholesale attack on VA benefits and services. And that's what his *Wall Street Journal* piece really was.

He brings up that old saw about separating combat and noncombat vets when paying out service-connected disability compensation. How is a leg lost in war worth more than a leg lost in peacetime? Further, anyone who watches the news knows the line between war and peace has become rather blurry in recent history.

Finally, what the VA pays in compensation for just about any disability is peanuts compared to what the courts are awarding for comparable disabilities in civilian liability cases. Whenever anyone shoots his mouth off about the high rates of VA compensation, I want to know why a soldier's sight is worth less than a civilian's sight.

Next, Mr. Beilenson brings up VA payment of compensation for such disabilities as "arthritis, diabetes and epilepsy." Such disabilities make up a tiny portion of the VA's compensation cases. And how does he know these disabilities "would have developed whether or not they were in the military."

Finally, any civilian working for a company with decent disability insurance gets benefits if catastrophic illness strikes. Why should members of the U.S. Army, Navy, Air Force and Marines be entitled to anything less?

Attacking the tax-free status of VA compensation, he says, "The assumption underlying this program is that a disabled veteran is not going to be able to work, or will earn less than he would otherwise." That may be Mr. Beilenson's assumption, but it was never the assumption of those who framed the compensation system.

In arguing that compensation simply isn't necessary for many now on the rolls, Mr. Beilenson assumes that most disabled veterans have jobs. He sees no reason why a disabled vet can't find work in today's high-tech economy, and maybe there are few reasons other than a horrendous propensity on the part of employers to discriminate against disabled people.

At any rate, Department of Labor (DoL) statistics on veterans of the Vietnam War period paint a very different picture than Mr. Beilenson's account. According to DoL, disabled vets are nearly twice as likely to be unemployed as nondisabled vets. Among the unemployed, DoL counts two-thirds of those Vietnam vets whose service-connected conditions are rated at 60 percent or more.

The American people don't want these disabled vets out on street corners selling apples and pencils. A Congressman should be honest about the consequences of his proposals before he blandly starts talking about throwing vets off the compensation rolls.

Mr. Beilenson also describes the VA pension program as "a separate government welfare system for veterans." Honestly, describing any veterans' program as "welfare" is an insult to every man and woman who has ever served in this country. Veterans' benefits are *earned* benefits.

Mr. Beilenson devotes a substantial portion of his *Wall Street Journal* piece to his argument for shutting down the VA health care system. In this, he cites a National Academy of Sciences (NAS) report that, he says, found the VA "wasteful, unnecessary and inefficient."

That judgment, in my opinion, grossly exaggerates what the NAS report really had to say. At any rate, everyone in veterans' affairs believes that report to be biased.

They believe it was heavily influenced by management personnel from the private sector of the medical economy—people whose employers stand to pick up at least \$11 billion in new business if the VA ever shuts down.

These are the people who told Mr. Beilenson that medical care costs more in the VA than it does in the private sector. It's hard to compare apples and oranges, but every study to date indicates the VA is less expensive and more efficient than the private sector in health care delivery. There are virtually no studies that show the VA to be more expensive.

There's also no research that substantiates Mr. Beilenson's charge that the VA medical system "is generally acknowledged to be less than first rate." Nor is there any justification for saying, "Veterans probably would receive better health care if the VA hospital system were abolished."

Whether he knows it or not—and I suspect he won't like hearing me say this—Mr. Beilenson is in the pocket of the private medical industry on this one. Abolition of the VA would pump a great deal of trade in the direction of private health care providers, and that's what motivates everything they say about the VA.

The VA's patient load is made up of veterans who are service-connected or medically indigent. These veterans would gain virtual-

ly nothing from closure of VA hospitals and clinics.

Those with service-connected conditions would lose a system that specializes in war-related disabilities, and thousands of poor veterans would be left without any source of treatment.

Not just veterans but American society as a whole would lose a great deal as well. Let's look at some facts that Mr. Beilenson chooses to ignore—contributions VA health care system makes to the practice of medicine by:

Training one third of America's physicians and countless other medical professionals,

Standing as an example of efficiency in health care delivery at a time when the cost of care in the private sector is going straight through the roof,

Conducting a medical research program that has produced Nobel laureates and counts the CAT-Scan as one of its achievements,

Gathering an immense amount of expertise on treatment and rehabilitation of persons with traumatic injuries,

Backing up a military medical system that's in shambles, and

Offering a potential gold mine in the area of gerontological research with a population who will hit the health crisis years a decade ahead of the general population.

That's just the VA's medical system. But shouldn't a U.S. Congressman also know more about the impact of the G.I. Bill on the educational level of America's work force? Shouldn't he check out how that program has touched virtually every institution of higher learning in America?

Shouldn't he be interested in the effect of VA home loan guaranteed programs on the development of private home ownership in our country? Shouldn't he look closely at its impact on our nation's construction and mortgage banking industries?

In the absence of answers to questions like those, it might be possible to buy Mr. Beilenson's assertion that the VA doesn't have the kind of public policy clout that deserves a slot in the President's Cabinet. But, with the answers to those questions, one can see how pervasive an influence the VA really wields in a broad spectrum of public policy concerns.

Finally, why shouldn't the head of the VA be present when the Cabinet discusses issues of war and peace? At those times, someone ought to remind the President and his key advisors that war's cost extends far beyond missiles, tanks, ships and fighter jets.

Someone ought to remind them that the human cost of war goes on for decades after the guns stop firing—that people lose arms, legs, eyes and life itself—that America's taxpayers will ultimately be required to pick up the monetary portion of those costs.

Mr. Beilenson describes America's veterans as a "special-interest group." I have to take exception to that. With their families, those veterans make up one third of the American population.

Those men and women, their spouses and their kids could hardly be described as a special-interest group at odds with average America. They are average America.

The only thing that sets them off is what they've done for our country and every one of its citizens, including Harvard educated lawyers who hale from the chic suburbs of L.A. In talking about issues that affect veterans lives, let's remember what they've done.

America's businesses, its workers, its teachers, its farmers, and many others are represented on the President's Cabinet. We don't have a quarrel with that. But who decided veterans deserve government administration of a lesser order than other Americans?

#### MONO LAKE'S DEFENDER

### HON. NORMAN D. SHUMWAY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SHUMWAY. Mr. Speaker, California and the Nation have lost a dedicated, articulate, and effective defender of our precious natural resources with the passing of David Gaines. The Sacramento Bee recently carried an editorial in tribute to David Gaines' contributions which details his successful effort to save Mono Lake. Prior to reapportionment, I had the honor of representing that unique saline lake, and to introduce legislation to protect it. With great sadness that David Gaines has gone, but with great pride in his achievements, I commend the following editorial to my colleagues' attention. I know that they will all join with me in extending condolences to those Mr. Gaines has left behind.

#### MONO LAKE'S DEFENDER

The name may not be familiar, but David Gaines was one Californian who really made a difference. When he founded the Mono Lake Committee 10 years ago, few people had ever heard of that remote, saline body of water in the Eastern Sierra, and practically no one seemed to care that it had long since been slated to be drained off to serve the growing thirst of Los Angeles.

But Gaines cared and cared deeply, campaigning tirelessly, first to overcome the indifference of local residents and then to draw the attention of the national media to the strange beauty of the lake and its vital importance to the tens of thousands of birds that nest there every year. In the process he managed to turn the preservation of Mono Lake into an environmental cause celebre and the lake itself into a most improbable tourist attraction.

Layer by layer, through court decisions, state statutes and acts of Congress that have variously declared the barren shoreline of Mono Lake a national forest scenic area, a state reserve and a federally protected preserve of critical environmental concern, he managed consistently to frustrate Los Angeles' efforts to export its water southward. And though the city has now come to the negotiating table to work out a long-term solution for Mono's future, the impact of Gaines' success is likely to reverberate far beyond the lake itself, working fundamental changes in the law of water rights in California and establishing new principles for the ways in which our dams and water conduits can be run.

Inevitably Gaines' death this week in an automobile accident recalls the passing more than 40 years ago of that other energetic advocate of the natural attractions of the Eastern Sierra, Father John Crowley, who likewise perished on its treacherous roads late one night just as his own efforts on behalf of the water resources of the region were about to reach fruition. Los Angeles, in respect, named a lake for Crowley. Gaines, in contrast, made a name for Mono,

and the fact that its survival now seems secure is probably the most fitting tribute to his memory.

#### DELIBERATION ON H.R. 3

### HON. LES AU COIN

OF OREGON

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. AU COIN. Mr. Speaker, as the House and Senate conferees continue their deliberations on H.R. 3, the omnibus trade bill, I'd like to share with my colleagues an excellent article on the perils of protectionism. It was written by Mr. Steve Newman, a customs broker in Portland, OR, with Newman, Wilson & Co. He is also president of the Pacific Northwest International Trade Association.

The article follows:

#### PROTECTIONIST MEASURES HURT, NOT HELP, U.S. BUSINESSES

(By Steve Newman)

The debate over international trade policy has intensified during the past year and will certainly be a focal point of the 1988 election season. No one suggests that our current trade deficit is either healthy or sustainable. Campaign debate should center on remedies to the current situation.

Should we reduce the deficits by restricting imports through increase quotas, tariffs and "voluntary" restraints? Or should we become more competitive in the international marketplace and expand our exports? Increasingly, observers of international trade believe that protectionism will not provide long-term answers to the U.S. balance-of-trade deficit.

Those who demand limits on imports insist that domestic industries are damaged by the flood of foreign products. They cry out for protections against textile, steel and automobile imports, claiming this approach is the sensible way to reverse the balance of trade and keep our economy healthy.

However, the facts suggest a different story. Trade restrictions may raise costs for American consumers while creating disincentives to American companies to increase efficiency.

Quotas and tariffs on clothing and textiles cost the American consumer \$20 billion a year in increased prices. Yet textile and clothing manufacturers have not been suffering—they just completed a record year for both production and profits. Furthermore, the average wage for domestic textile workers is less than \$7 an hour, \$2 below the average private-sector wage.

American steel producers have been protected by law. However, our steel industry, rather than reinvest profits in new production facilities to employ more Americans, has chosen to diversify into oil and gas production.

Detroit asked for and received the voluntary restraints on small-car imports. Foreign automakers simply sent us their higher-priced models and maintained their strong market share. Japanese automakers actually sent us fewer units but earned higher profits.

U.S. automakers performed well last year, but Americans paid about an extra \$5 billion as a result of voluntary restraints, pushing up prices on all automobiles sold here. It is the U.S. consumer who bears the cost of protectionist legislation. You will

pay higher prices and have less to choose from.

If we restrict imports, we must consider the price we will pay. Last year, Congress passed another Textile Quota Bill. Taiwanese buyers of Oregon wheat made it clear that if Congress refused to sustain the president's veto, the buyers would defer any purchases of Oregon white wheat.

The cost to Americans of protecting one job in the textile industry is estimated at \$86,000, based on the additional prices we pay for clothing. Is it worth it? Can we afford this approach?

Indeed, our trading partners maintain all types of trade barriers against American goods and services. We are told that Japan won't let particular products in and restricts imports of many items. The protectionists demand that we retaliate in kind.

In fact, the United States already protects an array of products, including peanuts, sugar and ice cream. We raise the duty on cucumbers from 1.5 cents to 3 cents between Sept. 1 and Nov. 30. We have absolute quotas on Parmesan and Gouda cheeses. Are we willing to do away with these barriers? We can hardly demand open markets and free access when we limit our own markets.

Oregon's economy—and the nation's—has become increasingly dependent on international trade. The world has become too small and its economies too interdependent to revert to the mercantilist, Smoot-Hawley Tariff days in the '30s. International trade services alone account for more than 2,500 jobs in Oregon, with an annual payroll of more than \$100 million.

If you add the agricultural and industrial jobs dependent on international trade, it becomes evident how vital trade is to our continued growth. We must expand our exports. We must learn to be competitive in the international market place. We must insist that our trading partners remove their barriers to trade and agree that we will do the same. Those who doubt our ability to compete do all of us a disservice.

#### VIET HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF IN NICARAGUA

### HON. BOB LIVINGSTON

OF LOUISIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. LIVINGSTON. Mr. Speaker, it is always important to learn from experience—especially when it comes from someone who has lived through the cruel, cold history of the conquest of South Vietnam.

Since we are on the eve of our yearly battle over the question of aid to the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, I urge my colleagues to read the following letter, which recently appeared in the New Orleans Times-Picayune. The author, Mr. Trang Thanh Le, draws a parallel between our experience in negotiating with the North Vietnamese Communists 15 years ago, and our current peace talks with the Communist regime in Nicaragua.

Mr. Speaker, no one wants to repeat the mistakes that we made in Vietnam and I urge my colleagues to heed Mr. Le's warning. Otherwise, years from now refugees from Nicaragua may be writing the same type of letters that Mr. Le is writing today.



[From the Times-Picayune, Dec. 8, 1987]

**VIET HISTORY REPEATING ITSELF IN NICARAGUA**

(By Trang Thanh Le)

NEW ORLEANS.—After having seen the communists cheat so many times in the past, I am seeing another scheme by the communists to rid themselves of the Contras in Nicaragua. What happened in Vietnam 15 years ago is happening now in Nicaragua.

In 1970, the Vietnamese communists tricked the United States and the whole world by saying they wanted to talk "peace." The whole world was excited by the idea.

Even though the conflict was between the Republic of Vietnam (South Vietnam) and Communist Vietnam (North Vietnam), the Vietnamese communists just wanted to talk to the government of the United States without the representation of South Vietnamese.

It was just like the Sandinistas now want to talk "peace" in Nicaragua without the Contras.

The reason for such a demand was simple—they knew they couldn't trick the South Vietnamese (and now the Contras). The South Vietnamese knew them too long and too well to be fooled by the "sweet peace talk."

To believe in the communists' accepting political opposition in a communist system is naive. Can anyone show a single communist country with political opposition?

When a communist government—in Vietnam, Nicaragua or anywhere else—wants to talk "peace," what it really means is how to get the opposition to surrender.

What the communists want is to seize power. They make all kinds of promises for reforms, but once they get the power, they never want to share power with anyone because the Communist Party is the only one that may exist in the communist system—otherwise it is not communist.

What the Sandinistas now want is not to negotiate seriously with the U.S. government. They will call for negotiation for years, waiting to prepare public opinion in the United States by their sympathizers, to create events to blame the U.S. government for not coming up with any solution to the conflict and to wait for a new U.S. government to give in to their demands.

I wish the American people understood more about the communists and their tactics. I am sure the U.S. government is wise enough not to fall into the same communist trap of 15 years ago.

**CONGRESS MUST NOT SUCCUMB TO NRA PROPAGANDA**

**HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH**

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, I understand that the NRA is trying to find somebody in Congress to file a bill that would legalize the sale of new machineguns. As the author of the amendment that the House passed to end the sale of new machineguns, I am not surprised. It reminds me of that motion picture promo: "They're back!"

I urge my colleagues not to be dazzled by fanciful ads that support unrestricted gun ownership. Today the subject is plastic handguns.

Tomorrow it may well be machineguns. At some point this lunacy must stop.

I trust that you will read carefully the op-ed piece by Ms. Kathleen Krog, a member of the Miami Herald editorial board, in the February 1, 1988, edition of that newspaper.

**THE NRA SHOOTS OFF ITS MOUTH AS INNOCENTS DIE**

(By Kathleen Krog)

On Jan. 26, Mattie Middleton, age 24, was walking down the street around 8:20 in the evening. She caught a bullet that gun owner Patrick Bernard Ferguson meant for a man in a car who had "made some negative comments" to him, according to the Herald's Jan. 28 In Brief column. Mattie Middleton died.

The day that Ferguson decided to shoot at a mouthy motorist, the National Rifle Association published full-page ads in two newspapers that I read: The Herald and The New York Times. The Herald ad features a woman's cast-off shoe with the words: "He's followed you for two weeks. He'll rape you in two minutes. Who cares?"

The Times ad shows a broken locket and says: "Your mother just surprised two burglars who don't like surprises. Who cares?"

The ads outline victims' terror. "A sudden spray of shattered glass. Brutal blows from a shadow. Then terror and torture eternity can't heal." You get the idea.

Then the ads list the people who care more about the criminal's rights than yours: "certain politicians," "most media," "four or five headline-seeking police chiefs," and "not enough judges."

The ads disclaim the NRA's intent to persuade everyone to own a firearm. The NRA just wants you to be sure that no one ever denies your Constitutional choice to own a gun.

The ads disturb. First off, they're hysterical. Second, those "four or five headline-seeking police chiefs" in actuality are the voting majorities of the International Association of Chiefs of Police and the Fraternal Order of Police, which both oppose "plastic guns." These weapons contain so little metal that they could elude detectors at airports, courthouses, and other public buildings where officials had detectors installed because so many Americans exercise their Constitutional choice.

The NRA opposes proposed Federal legislation that would ban the manufacture of plastic guns. It was a preventive measure, since the guns aren't on the market yet. The Secret Service—those stalwart guardians of the President—backed the legislation offered by Sen. Strom Thurmond, R-S.C., about as conservative as a legislator can be.

But the NRA leaned on its Senate pal, Sen. James McClure, R-Idaho, and other conservatives who believe in some Constitutional choices but not others, and the measure was defeated 47-42. The close vote heartened gun-control supporters and scared the NRA.

Defections in the gun-toters' ranks! Why, if enough senators find the temerity to keep undetectable weapons away from would-be terrorists, what's next? Before you know it, they'll be snatching .357 Magnums right out of a man's home. Give those noncaring, bleeding-heart liberal wimps one little piece of the shooting gallery, and next thing they'll want all the guns in America melted down and made into modern art.

**CRIME PREVENTION FIRST**

Hence the NRA's hysteria. The warm-and-fuzzy "I'm the NRA" ads just weren't get-

ting the message across as well as a gut-level appeal to the fear of crime in all of us. My teen-age son was robbed at gunpoint. What if he had been carrying a gun too? A shoot-out over a bicycle. Shootings over nothing happen all the time now. More people are dying because more people—noncriminals—own guns.

Crime is a terrible problem. But if members forced the NRA to spend half its annual lobbying budget on pushing for honest-to-God crime-prevention measures, the crime rate certainly would fall. Just as certainly, the rate of accidental gun deaths will climb as steadily as the crime level does now as long as gun controls are kept off the books.

The NRA tells me I've got a Constitutional choice to own weapons, and that I should protect it. Right. Tell it to Mattie Middleton's family.

**REPEAL OF THE PREPRODUCTION EXPENSE RULES**

**HON. HAL DAUB**

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing, together with my colleague on the Ways and Means Committee, BYRON DORGAN, a bill to repeal a complex and burdensome accounting requirement for farmers under the Internal Revenue Code. I am proud to say that we have accumulated over 30 original cosponsors before introducing this bill.

The 1986 Tax Reform Act imposed a complicated set of accounting rules, known as the uniform capitalization rules, on many taxpayers including farmers and ranchers. Now farmers and ranchers do not have much use for complicated redtape imposed upon them by the bureaucrats in Washington, and that's the major reason why Congress allowed farmers to continue to use the cash method of accounting after the Tax Reform Act. The complexities required to account for growing crops and livestock under other methods of accounting are greater in farming than they are in other businesses.

But by imposing the uniform capitalization rules on farmers the law is requiring the farmer-taxpayer to accumulate the costs of producing an animal and bringing it to production over a period of years. In fact, the period during which these costs must be accumulated runs from the time of conception—yes, that's right, conception—to the date when the animal has its first yield, that is, when it drops its first calf. Imagine what the complexities of this rule are when a farmer has hundreds of head of cattle in their operation. Under this law, a farmer has the virtually impossible task of assigning the specific costs to each animal in his herd.

One of the justifications for this provision in the Tax Reform Act was that tax shelter farmers were making use of deductions from breeding and feeding operations to decrease their tax liabilities. It was felt that this provision would help to prevent business investors from farming the Tax Code, and help resolve the problems created by overproduction. But, the passive loss rules which were ultimately in-

cluded in the Tax Reform Act have effectively eliminated those investors who were not actually engaged in farming. The result is that these rules now only serve to cause additional bureaucratic nightmares for farmers. The reason for the rule no longer exists and it should be repealed.

Our legislation would repeal the preproductive period expense rules and allow farmers who utilize the simpler and more practical cash method of accounting to deduct costs as they are incurred. These rules would be repealed retroactively to January 1, 1987, when they originally came into law. This legislation has the support of many farm organizations, including the American Farm Bureau, National Milk Producers Federation, National Cattlemen's Association, American Horse Council, and the National Grange and I urge my colleagues to cosponsor our bill.

#### TRIBUTE TO LEE TENG-HUI

##### HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I rise to express my admiration and respect for the new President of Taiwan, Lee Teng-Hui. President Lee Teng-Hui succeeded President Chiang Ching-Kuo following Chiang's death on January 13.

Lee Teng-Hui was educated at Cornell University where he earned his doctoral degree. He was recruited into government service in 1972 by former President Chiang Ching-Kuo. Lee served in a number of government posts including mayor of Taipei and Governor of Taiwan Province. Lee's preformance in each of these positions demonstrated his dedication to public service as well as his energy, wisdom, and leadership abilities.

President Lee's new job will be his most difficult. I am confident that he will continue to guide Taiwan toward even greater economic prosperity and political liberalization. Taiwan's continuing economic and political stability is extremely important to the interests of the United States and serves as an example for other nations in eastern Asia and the Pacific Rim. Lee's administration will, I am sure, honor his mentor Chiang Ching-Kuo and set a standard for future administrations to emulate.

#### A TRIBUTE TO CLARK BOWER

##### HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, each year since 1981 Pennsylvania Farmer magazine and the cooperative extension services of the five States serviced by the magazine—Pennsylvania, West Virginia, Maryland, Delaware, and New Jersey, have cosponsored the "Master Farmer" award. This award is based on a farmer's financial progress, farm management and marketing skills and personal growth during their careers.

This year Perry County farmer Clark Bower of Blain, PA, received the coveted Master Farmer Award during ceremonies at the Pennsylvania State Farm Show in Harrisburg. He was also honored last week at the annual banquet of the Perry County Cooperative Extension Service at the Perry Valley Grange.

Mr. Speaker, Clark Bower represents the very best in farming. He and his wife Donna, along with son Logan, brother Ben, and neighbor and longtime employee Bob Hostteter, work long hours on the farm milking holstein cows and growing corn, wheat, oats, alfalfa and mixed hay. His strong belief in staying out of debt and promoting farm safety is one which most reflects that of a master farmer.

I would like to ask my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to join me in extending congratulations to Clark Bower, his family and employees for earning this prestigious award.

#### THE FAILURE OF SWAPO

##### HON. DONALD E. "BUZ" LUKENS

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. DONALD E. LUKENS. Mr. Speaker, over the past few decades, thousands of innocent Namibians have died in SWAPO's "war of liberation" in Namibia, as time goes on, as more civilians die needlessly, one thing becomes increasingly clear: SWAPO is the least successful liberation movement of all time. Twenty-one years after the start of its "armed struggle" SWAPO controls not 1 inch of Namibian territory.

As a Namibian Government cabinet minister recently put it, "SWAPO has discovered that \* \* \* calls for the implementation of U.N. Resolution 435—on Namibian independence—and communiques claiming incredible military triumphs are no substitute for an effective administration addressing the needs of the people." "SWAPO has not provided effective administration. It has done nothing but provide a barrier to meaningful independence for Namibia.

The members and supporters of the Namibian Transitional Government of National Unity [TGNU] know Namibia has no alternative to peace. Prosperous and stable independence, so rare in the world today, depends on peace and national reconciliation. All Namibians are entitled to a peaceful, stable unified nation.

SWAPO does not seem to agree, SWAPO remains committed to an "armed struggle" as their only means of achieving independence. The parties represented in the TGNU have chosen a different road, the road of national reconciliation within the framework of a bill of fundamental rights.

When the TGNU took office, on June 17, 1985, the first chairman of the cabinet, Dawid Bezuidenhout, spoke eloquently of their goals:

The struggle to which we have committed ourselves is a struggle for peace, for national reconciliation, for political stability and economic and social progress for all in this, our beloved land \* \* \*.

Unity in diversity has become our watch-

word. Peace and national reconciliation our battle cry \* \* \*.

Our commitment to justice, decency and respect for the rights of all, is evident from the inclusion of the rights enumerated in the \* \* \*. Bill of Fundamental Rights and Objectives \* \* \* the National assembly shall not be competent to pass laws abolishing, diminishing or derogating from any fundamental right \* \* \*.

The hour is late, too much blood has already been spilled. The chance to achieve our goal is within our grasp. Let us seize it now.

In legally abolishing apartheid and other forms of discrimination, in developing a democratic constitution, in reaching out peacefully to SWAPO, in working hard to improve life in Namibia for the benefit of all Namibians, the TGNU has shown that it meant what it said. It deserves our support.

#### TRIBUTE TO ANNA DATO

##### HON. ROBERT J. LAGOMARSINO

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. LAGOMARSINO. Mr. Speaker, I rise to pay tribute to Anna Dato who is retiring from the Goleta Chamber after 13 years as executive director of the Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce.

During her time with the chamber, Anna Dato initiated a monthly chamber newsletter, started chamber mixers, was one of the founders of Goleta Valley Days and the coordinator each year since its inception. She also instituted the annual program of work for the chamber and quarterly board planning meetings. She participated in the initial fundraiser for a Lancaster scholarship at UCSB.

Anna did not limit herself to the chamber, but held several additional community positions. She served as a director of Goleta Beautiful, a member of the Los Carneros Park Advisory Committee, and a director of the Coalition for Cityhood. She has been one of the leading fundraisers for the Goleta Depot's annual fundraiser each year.

Through her efforts, Anna obtained advertising funding each year for the Goleta Chamber and other county chambers and initiated a policy of providing yearly funding for capital improvements to the Goleta Valley Historical Society and the Goleta Depot.

Anna's contributions in the area of management and community service were recognized in 1981 by the Santa Barbara County Women's Achievement Awards. In 1985, Anna was named the "Goleta Woman of the Year."

Anna's service to the chamber was recognized at the Goleta Chamber's annual dinner on January 15 where she was presented with an honorary lifetime membership in the Goleta Valley Chamber of Commerce.

I join with the community of Goleta Valley in saluting Anna's efforts and expressing our sincere appreciation for her many years of service.



## A NATIONAL SALUTE TO HOSPITALIZED VETERANS

### HON. BILL SCHUETTE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SCHUETTE. Mr. Speaker, today, I would like to take the opportunity to pay tribute to hospitalized veterans across the Nation and to let my colleagues know that the week of February 8-14 has been designated as "National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans."

Special activities are being planned at each of our Veterans' Administration medical facilities and this national salute, especially since it has been chosen to be observed during the week of Valentine's Day, represents an ideal annual opportunity for all Americans to express their compassion and gratitude to those who served our Nation to protect our freedom by visiting those who are hospitalized.

In celebrating the National Salute to Hospitalized Veterans, we are paying tribute to the thousands of veterans who are hospitalized each year to help establish and promote a continuing awareness of the patriotism of these Americans. In addition, through open house activities in VA hospitals, it will increase community awareness of the role of VA activities, and will most importantly, encourage Americans of all ages to join the faithful volunteers whose concern for hospitalized veterans brings them to VA medical facilities throughout the year by serving as hospital volunteers.

Mr. Speaker, I hope my colleagues will join with me in celebrating the week of February 8-14 as a special tribute to hospitalized veterans. As we all know, America's veterans are the backbone of our freedom. Although it is easy to forget the important contributions and sacrifices our veterans have made, especially when we are not faced with threats to peace and our way of life; this week serves to help remind us of the debt we owe to all veterans. It is they who have given their resolution, their courage, their love for this country, and sometimes their blood, in order to protect peace and freedom for all peoples throughout the world.

Therefore, I invite you, Mr. Speaker, and my colleagues in the U.S. House of Representatives, to join me in participating in this salute to our hospitalized veterans by taking time out of your busy schedules to visit your nearest Veterans' Administration Medical Center to say thanks to a veteran for the patriotic service that has preserved our Nation's precious freedom.

### HUNGRY CHILDREN CANNOT WAIT

### HON. CHRISTOPHER SHAYS

OF CONNECTICUT

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SHAYS. Mr. Speaker, today I would like to address an issue of utmost importance—the famine threatening the African Continent. Another year of drought has placed an estimated 5 to 8 million people on the brink of

## EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

starvation. It is imperative that the United States generously respond to this impending tragedy. Our assistance will be critical in saving the lives of millions of Africans.

I am pleased to submit for the RECORD an article written by Willet Weeks, director of African Programs for Save the Children Federation in Westport, CT. Mr. Weeks highlights the urgency of the situation and applauds the generosity of the United States during the last famine relief efforts.

I urge my colleagues to support all efforts to assist the drought-stricken African nations. There is enough food in the world to feed over 7 billion people. When the current world population stands at approximately 5 billion, we must ask ourselves why hunger continues to be one of the most devastating problems facing the world. Now is the time to act. "Hungry children cannot wait."

### HUNGRY CHILDREN CANNOT WAIT

(By Willet Weeks)

WESTPORT, CT.—Last month, I was in Ethiopia's Shoa province, at the end of what should have been the "rainy" season. Normally, the fields would have been filled with sorghum eight feet high, bent under the weight of seed-filled heads. Instead, I saw fields of straw, fit only to be plowed under or used as animal fodder.

In good times, 10-foot towers in every field would be occupied by boys armed with slingshots, mounting a never-ending vigil against birds that threaten the harvest. This year, they stood empty as a flock picked unmolested over the meager remains of a field that should have fed a village for a year.

Terrible drought has returned with unprecedented suddenness. The centuries-old pattern—drought once a decade—has been cruelly disrupted. Five million people are again at risk of starvation.

The playful youngsters who grabbed at my hands and danced around were unaware that death again stalks them. Those children are alive because of a worldwide effort—perhaps one of the largest logistics operations mounted outside of war. Most of the food was from the USA; most of the money that financed its delivery came from the U.S. people. And the overwhelming bulk of aid reached those for whom it was intended. Save the Children has records covering every bag of food it was responsible for, from the moment it reached the port of Assab to its delivery to a family in Shoa. The loss rate was less than 1 percent, a truly remarkable figure.

Steps must be taken to increase Ethiopia's food security by helping small farmers increase productivity and by establishing strategic reserves. But even with a multibillion-dollar effort in place, it would be well into the next century before Ethiopia could rely upon its own resources.

But the children can't wait.

For them, we must act now.

The U.S. government has pledged 115,000 metric tons of grain; others have followed its lead; all available reserves in Ethiopia are being marshaled. Another great relief effort is in motion. And it must extend beyond Ethiopia. In the Sudan, areas are in crisis already; in Angola and Mozambique, civil war isolates families from aid needed for survival.

A tall order for a relief-weary USA. But the stakes are too high not to respond.

February 3, 1988

## WHO GOVERNS COLOMBIA?

### HON. LAWRENCE J. SMITH

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SMITH of Florida. Mr. Speaker, the Miami Herald recently asked, "Who governs Colombia?" For anybody concerned about the increasing flood of cocaine into the United States, that is a crucial question in 1988.

The Medellin cartel has declared war on public officials who oppose drug trafficking. The recent murder of Attorney General Carlos Mauro Hoyos is only the latest example of the depths to which the cocaine barons will go to protect their illicit operations.

President Virgilio Barco has assured the Colombian people that he will not cave in to the threats of the cartel. As chairman of the House Foreign Affairs Committee's Task Force on International Narcotics Control, I encourage and applaud this decision. The murders and trafficking occur in Colombia, and Colombia must take whatever steps are necessary to purge this cancer. If their response is too little, it may constitute a signal to the cartel that the Government is not willing to fight them.

To further complicate an already difficult situation, the New York Times reported on February 1, that "many influential Colombians" are becoming weary of the war against the drug traffickers. I trust this is hyperbole. Democratic governments cannot endure when the rule of law is undermined by interests that recognize no law except that dispensed from the barrel of a gun. And make no mistake about it, the Medellin cartel sees itself as above every law in Colombia and elsewhere.

The United States remains willing to provide sufficient legitimate assistance to Colombia in our mutual war against the poison of the Medellin cartel. The sooner Colombia realizes that its future is at stake here, the sooner our two countries could work together and defeat the cartel.

For the benefit of my colleagues, I urge them to read the January 27, 1988, editorial of the Miami Herald.

### COLOMBIA: "TOTAL WAR"

Who governs Colombia? The Medellin Cartel? Or the democratically elected government headed by President Virgilio Barco?

The question arises anew after the latest casualty in what drug traffickers have branded a "total war." Colombian Attorney General Carlos Mauro Hoyos, one of the nation's toughest officials in that war, was kidnapped and later assassinated on Monday. A group calling itself "the Extraditables" claimed responsibility. The group reportedly was formed by Colombian drug traffickers indicted by the U.S. Government, which seeks their extradition.

Mr. Hoyos had just finished a week in Medellin investigating the release from prison last month of cartel boss Jorge Luis Ochoa. Recently Mr. Hoyos told Colombia's senate that murders of public officials were never solved because, "Fear has us in a state of siege, and the proponents [of killing] have as accomplices the terror-stricken citizens."

Indeed, traffickers practice the worst kind of terrorism. They fight their war with two

powerful weapons: ruthless willingness to murder whoever gets in their way, and unlimited money to bribe whoever can serve their evil cause. Their strategic objectives are also two-fold: to continue flooding the United States with their poisonous substance, and to avoid being extradited at all costs. "Better to be in a Colombian grave than an American jail," they say.

In a nationwide television address on Monday night, President Barco said that his government would not "cave in to vile blackmail and infamous threats" from Colombia's cocaine barons. His courageous stance deserves the fullest U.S. support. If a "total war" is required to end the cartel's ruthless threat to Colombian society's very foundations, then Colombia must fight. Its very survival is at stake.

The Reagan Administration should offer to provide whatever assistance—such as helicopters, arms, and other materiel—Mr. Barco's government might need. Most of all, the Colombian government must summon all its resolve and end this anarchic menace no matter what it involves or how long it takes.

#### INTRODUCTION OF LONG-TERM HEALTH CARE BILL

##### HON. HAL DAUB

OF NEBRASKA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. DAUB. Mr. Speaker, today, I and my colleague from Massachusetts, BRIAN DONNELLY, are pleased to introduce H.R. 3900, the long-term health care amendments of 1988. Ours is a long overdue bill which addresses the most pressing concern of America's elderly population: Long-term care and nursing home costs.

Through a combination of Government support and private sector stimulation, our initiative provides for Medicare coverage of long-term care expenses and establishes private sector incentives for the purchase of long-term care insurance.

And while our bill extends many new benefits to those eligible for Medicare, it demands no premiums or surcharges from beneficiaries. The program is entirely self-financing.

Further, the tax incentives included in our legislation are directed toward both individuals and employers. As a result, our bill motivates all phases of the private sector to take the initiative and plan for a secure future.

Above all, Mr. Speaker, we have stressed balance and fairness in this legislation: Balance between the Government and the private sector, and fairness to an ever-growing older population. I urge my colleagues to join me and Mr. DONNELLY in sponsoring H.R. 3900, this needed long-term health care bill.

#### FAREWELL TO A FINE NEWSMAN

##### HON. E. CLAY SHAW, JR.

OF FLORIDA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SHAW. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to note the retirement of a member of the Washington press corps whom many of us have known during his years here.

Hal Cessna was the Washington correspondent for Cox Broadcasting for the past 18 years and covered Capitol Hill, the White House and many Government agencies. He did a fine job and was always gracious and thorough no matter how tough his deadline.

Hal was the sole Cox correspondent responsible for regular reports to six major radio stations around the country, including WIOD in Miami, as well as a half-hour television program in three cities. His background on the issues was impressive, his reports were fair and objective, and his interviewing style was always pleasant and personal.

Mr. Speaker, in a world in which representatives of the media are often considered antagonistic, it has been a pleasure to work with Hal Cessna. Hal did his job—news reporting—with a minimum of fanfare and a maximum of competence. Hal has been a reporter since 1946 and his experience showed.

I understand that Hal plans to pursue writing during his retirement and hopes to build a home with his wife, Char, on the eastern shore of Maryland. I wish him the best of success in the years ahead.

#### A TRIBUTE TO DEREK JAMES WARNER

##### HON. GEORGE W. GEKAS

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. GEKAS. Mr. Speaker, Sunday, February 7, 1988, will be remembered as a very special day in the life of one young man from my district, Derek James Warner of Harrisburg, PA. Derek Warner, son of Mr. and Mrs. G.N. Warner, has earned Boy Scouts' top honor—the Eagle Award—which he will receive before family, friends, and his Congressman during a ceremony at Mount Laurel Church of God in Harrisburg.

Derek, a member of Boy Scout Troop 368, has displayed exceptional service and leadership in his work with Scouting. I would like to extend my congratulations to Derek and would ask my colleagues in the U.S. Congress to join me in paying tribute to him on this very special occasion.

#### HST EXAMPLE IS ONE TO FOLLOW ON AID TO CONTRAS

##### HON. BILL EMERSON

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. EMERSON. Mr. Speaker, as we prepare to debate aid to the Contras today, we face a critical test of our commitment toward the future of democracy. I commend to the attention of the House the following piece which appeared on January 28 in the Southeast Missourian, the largest daily newspaper in my district. As the editorial vividly points out, a great many lessons can be learned from the example of a great defender of democracy in another generation, President Harry Truman.

HST EXAMPLE IS ONE TO FOLLOW ON AID TO CONTRAS

(By Peter Kinder)

"Communist domination in this hemi-

sphere can never be negotiated."—President John F. Kennedy, Inaugural address.

Congress will have a decisive vote next week on President Reagan's request to aid the Nicaraguan democratic resistance, the contras. The presidency of the only Missourian ever to occupy the office provides an instructive lesson.

Consider this arresting passage from Harry Truman and the Crisis Presidency, by Bert Cochran, in a chapter relating how the Truman Doctrine containing Communist expansion came into being. A climactic moment in the White House early in 1947 for Truman, his top advisers, and Senate leaders is described:

"The meeting was turning sour. Acheson (Assistant Secretary of State Dean Acheson), the real guiding spirit of the enterprise at State agitatedly asked permission to intervene, and when the President called upon him to speak, he let out all the stops. In the past eighteen months, he declared, Soviet pressure on the Straits, on Iran, and on northern Greece had brought the Balkans to the point where a highly possible Soviet breakthrough might open the continents to Soviet penetration.

"Like apples in a barrel infected by one rotten one, the corruption of Greece would affect Iran and all to the east. It would also carry infection to Africa through Asia Minor and Egypt, and to Europe through Italy and France, already threatened by the strongest domestic Communist parties in Western Europe.

"The Soviet Union was playing one of the great gambles in history at minimal cost. It did not need to win all the possibilities. Even one or two offered immense gains. We and we alone are in a position to break up the play," Acheson concluded.

"A long silence followed. No further 'irrelevant' questions were asked. Who would dare? Vandenberg (Michigan Republican and Senate Majority Leader Arthur Vandenberg), greatly impressed, promised his support. . . ."

The hero of the piece, in my view, is a clear-eyed Democratic President from Missouri named Harry S. Truman, who acted decisively and with firm resolve at a critical moment in history. He asked for and received from Congress \$400 million in economic and military aid for Greece and Turkey to fend off Communist threats. Greece and Turkey later joined the NATO alliance and are free nations today because of Truman's bold response.

In so acting, Truman fulfilled Winston Churchill's characterization of him that he "did more to contain Communism than any man who ever lived."

The man from Independence acted squarely within the grand tradition of the Democratic Party of my grandfathers, the party that fought World War II, invented the doctrine of Containment, and led the West against the Soviet empire.

What a tragedy it is for America that the congressional wing of today's Democratic Party is thoroughly dominated, not by lineal descendants of Harry Truman in this foreign policy sense, but by a bunch of blame-America first, 'San Francisco Democrats' (in Ambassador Jean Kirkpatrick's phrase) who refuse to face the stark reality of what is happening in Central America.

Is that too strong? Consider this characterization of House Speaker Jim Wright's handling of the issue by a moderate commentator, Paul Greenberg, who is Editor of the Pine Bluff (Ark.) Commercial and a nationally syndicated columnist:

"Speaking of the ridiculous, intemperate, and irrational, that's a fair description of



the Democratic leadership's policy toward Central America: Ignore the threat from Nicaragua, or rather from the Soviet Union and Cuba via Nicaragua. Undermine aid to the one force eager to curb this threat—the contras. Hogtie the President with constitutionally dubious tactics like the Boland Amendment. And generally pretend that these Stalinistas are a bunch of innocuous agrarian reformers—rather than Communists bent on turning Central America into the next Vietnam."

Missourians can be proud, however, that at least one Democratic Member of Congress from our state takes a Trumanesque leadership position by standing for aid to the contras. He is Ike Skelton, who represents the Sixth District in western Missouri (including Truman's birthplace, Lamar), and who longs for a restoration in the Democratic Party of Truman's vision in national security and foreign policy.

Eighteen months ago, when Congress narrowly approved \$100 million in military and economic aid to the contras, the resolution was introduced in the House by this courageous Missouri Democrat. It passed only because Skelton was joined by 52 members of his party, or 20% of House Democrats, in bucking their party's left wing.

Democrats who think they can prosper in the long run by making Central America safe for the Brezhnev Doctrine should reflect on the Truman example and its living embodiment today, Congressman Ike Skelton.

They might also reflect on the fact that as liberal ideologues have taken over the Democratic Party in the five elections since 1968:

The Democrats have won just one contest for the White House (and that by a hair's breadth over an unelected caretaker), losing three times by historic landslides;

In those five elections, the Democrats, for so long the nation's majority party, have won a puny 21 percent of the electoral votes;

Their two most recent thrashings have been at the hands of a previously unemployed movie actor who won 44 states (1980) and 49 states (1984), and who forty years ago was a labor union president and a proud, Harry Truman Democrat.

Forty years ago this year, Harry Truman kicked the leftists out of his party and, facing challenges from both Strom Thurmond and his "Dixiecrats" on the right and from Henry Wallace on his left, held the great, anti-Communist center in a lonely battle that won him the greatest upset in American political history.

I think we know how the man from Independence would handle this one, were he alive today.

#### FARMER TAX REFORM LEGISLATION

#### HON. BYRON L. DORGAN

OF NORTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. DORGAN of North Dakota. Mr. Speaker, today I am introducing a bill for myself and 34 of our colleagues designed to repeal a complex and burdensome accounting requirement for farmers under the Internal Revenue Code.

The Tax Reform Act of 1986 applies the uniform capitalization rules to taxpayers engaged in the trade or business of farming

where the preproductive period of the farm product is more than 2 years. As a result, livestock farmers must maintain records on the costs attributable to each animal and cannot deduct those costs until that animal goes into production. While the farmer may elect not to follow these rules and deduct costs as they are incurred, they would then be required to use straight-line depreciation schedules on all farm assets. The administrative benefit the farmer would receive from electing out of the uniform capitalization rules would be more than offset by the financial loss in depreciation schedules.

This provision was originally included in the House version of the Tax Reform Act and was designed to help prevent business investors from farming the Tax Code. But, the passive loss rules which were ultimately included in the Tax Reform Act have effectively eliminated those investors who were not actually engaged in farming. The uniform capitalization rules for preproductive period expenses now only serve as an additional bureaucratic nightmare for farmers. Under this law, a farmer has the virtually impossible task of assigning the specific costs to each animal in his herd.

Our legislation would repeal the preproductive period expense rules and allow farmers who utilize the cash method of accounting to deduct costs as they are incurred. These rules would be repealed retroactively to January 1, 1987, when they originally came into law. This legislation has the support of many farm organizations including the American Farm Bureau, National Milk Producers Federation, National Cattlemen Association, American Horse Council, and the National Grange.

#### THE \$32 BILLION DEFENSE DEPARTMENT SET-ASIDE: IMPLICATIONS FOR MINORITY ENTERPRISE

#### HON. PETER J. VISCLOSKY

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. VISCLOSKY. Mr. Speaker, on January 28, 1988, I had the honor of participating in a hearing in Chicago, IL, sponsored by Representative GUS SAVAGE entitled "The \$32 Billion Defense Department Set-Aside: Implications for Minority Enterprise." Because of the importance of this issue, I would like to share with my colleagues my opening remarks.

TESTIMONY OF REPRESENTATIVE PETER J. VISCLOSKY ON THE SECTION 1207 MINORITY 5 PERCENT DOD SET-ASIDE JANUARY 29, 1988

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. I am pleased to be here today as the House Defense Procurement Policy Panel and the speaker's task force on minority enterprise examine the implementation of the section 1207 minority business set-aside. This 5 percent set-aside is the largest one in U.S. history, and offers us an unprecedented opportunity to increase contracting prospects for small disadvantaged businesses. This panel is convened here today not to castigate the Department of Defense for failure to meet the set-aside, but to discover a constructive manner in which to meet this 5 percent goal.

Across the State line in northwest Indiana, we have seen small disadvantaged businesses shoulder a disproportionate burden during the economically devastating times which have swept the Midwest. The recession of the early 1980's exacerbated the problems facing the minority men and women who struggle to be entrepreneurs and small business owners. Mandating a set-aside is one way of ensuring that these business enterprises will receive an equitable share of Federal business opportunities.

In spite of P.L. 99-661's directive, DOD has only negligibly increased the percentage of small disadvantaged businesses receiving contracts. It is clear that further efforts to attract and assist minority businesses with the process must be undertaken. More substantial technical advice, involvement of local, and State Government, and additional mandates and incentives for contracting officers and prime contractors may be advisable. Perhaps the size of the businesses which may qualify for the set-aside should be increased. Finally, it may be necessary to establish rules to ensure that minority participants receive access to the full range of types of projects, from supplying services and goods to technologically advanced activities.

The Department of Defense is responsible for almost 80 percent of all Government purchases. As the title of this conference states, the 5 percent set-aside has the potential to direct \$32 billion to minority businesses and the communities in which they are situated. This translates into 250,000 jobs. The legislative intent is clear; the implications for economic development are obvious. Why then has the DOD been unable to reach the 5 percent goal? What steps can be taken to realize the \$32 billion set-aside? I hope that the distinguished businesswomen and businessmen who are here today will lend their expertise to the resolution of these questions. We must ensure that the benefits of our system of free enterprise are available to everyone, not just a selected few.

#### BEWARE OF THE NOISE

#### HON. LAMAR S. SMITH

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SMITH of Texas. Mr. Speaker, allow me to read a letter to the editor by M.L. Gilliam that appeared in the San Antonio Light yesterday and was headlined, "Don't worry about that little noise:"

It first became apparent about 3 months ago—the little noise under my car that I didn't want to hear.

"It's not too bad," I thought. "It'll go away." It didn't, but I still didn't want to hear it. It got worse. Finally, I took it to a mechanic.

"It's a filter in your transmission," he said. "Didn't you hear that noise?" I didn't want to hear it. I had just shelled out \$300 to a plumber. Daughter's college tuition was coming up again. We were making long-delayed vacation plans.

"I'll be back," I said. A month later, the noise was even worse. I finally drove back to see the mechanic. The filter and the transmission, itself, were in bad shape. The repair estimate: \$2,500. "Like I've always said," the me-

chanic intoned, shaking his head, "you can pay me now or you can pay me later. If you'da brought it in when you first heard that noise, you'da been out of here for a lot less."

Do you hear that little noise down in Central America? What's that, you say? You don't want to hear it? Does anybody remember the little noises coming out of Germany and Japan in the 1930's? We didn't want to hear them, either, did we?

## INTRODUCTION OF THRIFT CHARTER ENHANCEMENT ACT

**HON. DOUG BARNARD, JR.**

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. BARNARD. Mr. Speaker, today, on behalf of Mr. PARRIS and myself, I am pleased to introduce the Thrift Charter Enhancement Act of 1988. This bill is intended to increase the attractiveness of thrift institutions, particularly troubled thrifts, to a wide range of potential investors and thus enhance the value of thrift charters. Its central thrust would be to remove certain onerous features of thrift regulation that are now reducing the desirability of thrift ownership and preventing new acquisitions of failing and healthy thrifts alike. The resulting private investment that could be expected from enactment of the bill would inject much needed capital into the thrift industry and significantly help the FSLIC to find buyers for troubled institutions. The following are some of the reasons such a result is especially important at this time:

The amount of capital raised by last year's Competitive Equality Banking Act is likely to be insufficient to meet FSLIC's needs in dealing with the industry's failures.

The healthy portion of the thrift industry will not be able to bear any additional insurance burden without creating a substantial additional incentive to leave FSLIC.

A bailout of the FSLIC by the U.S. Treasury would be extraordinarily unpopular, if not impossible, politically.

A merger of the FSLIC with the FDIC would be politically unpopular—neither the thrift nor the banking industry supports such an action—and would produce a single fund that might well be insufficient to protect against potential losses of the two industries combined.

The investment of additional private capital would reduce the costs to FSLIC associated with the disposal of failed thrifts, reduce the number of new failures, and sustain the growth necessary to increase FSLIC premium receipts. The Thrift Charter Enhancement Act of 1988 proposes only modest changes in thrift status, but they are designed specifically to attract new investors and to keep current investors interested in thrift ownership. The following are some examples of the bill's provisions.

Debt issuance and affiliate transaction restrictions would be relaxed for thrifts and thrift holding companies so they more closely resemble those governing banks and bank holding companies.

New, or "de novo," institutions, which now have stricter regulatory requirements applied

to them than do other institutions, would be granted equal regulatory treatment following 3 years of compliance with the stricter requirements.

Prohibitions against serving on the boards of different financial institutions would be limited to anti-competitive circumstances.

"Net worth maintenance agreements," which now require companies acquiring a thrift to guarantee the thrift's net worth indefinitely, would be limited as to time.

## HOW NOT TO RUN THE RAILROADS

**HON. NORMAN F. LENT**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. LENT. Mr. Speaker, as a proponent of the public stock offering for the sale of Conrail, I would like to call Members' attention to an article in the February 8, 1988, issue of *Forbes* magazine. Entitled "How not to run a railroad," the article chronicles the Conrail success story and the effective leadership of its chairman, L. Stanley Crane. It also focuses on the need for Congress to take care in its deliberations on proposed amendments to the 1989 Staggers Act. I recommend this article to each and every Member.

### HOW NOT TO RUN THE RAILROADS

(By James Cook)

Less than a year after Consolidated Rail Corp. went public in the largest initial public stock offering in U.S. history, its feisty boss, L. Stanley Crane, is worried that Congress is about to legislate Conrail and the rest of the railroad industry back into bankruptcy.

Crane's labor in transforming an amalgam of bankrupt railroads that had been taken over by the federal government into a viable independent property ranks as one of the great managerial triumphs of the postwar era. But now a group of shippers, primarily in the utility and coal industries, complains that they're the helpless captive of the railroad octopus, and are trying to persuade Congress to reregulate the industry. Crane reckons their proposal could cost Conrail \$400 million in revenues and wipe out the \$270 million or so Conrail earned last year. "You take away \$400 million in revenues," he says, "and there's no way I could take \$400 million of expenses out of the company unless I abandon a hell of a lot of track out there."

Crane, now 72, is understandably proud of what he has accomplished at Conrail in the nearly eight years since he retired as head of Southern Railway, now Norfolk Southern. From his headquarters in Philadelphia, he not only got the company back on its feet but he made it one of the most efficient and aggressively managed railroads in the U.S. today. Conrail's operating ratio—expenses as a percentage of revenue—went from 106% in 1980 to 87.2% in 1986.

Thus did Conrail move out of the red and solidly into the black, from a 1980 operating loss of \$188 million to a 1986 operating profit of \$403 million—\$359 million if you eliminate various temporary employee benefit and tax concessions. Conrail did so despite a \$224 million drop in revenues, to \$3.1 billion. In the process, Conrail's share of the

eastern railroad freight market gradually expanded.

Special dispensations from most of the parties involved were crucial to Conrail's turnaround—\$3.28 billion in government money, state and federal tax concessions, authority to cease passenger operations, scrap 9,300 miles of track and let go 35,000 freight employees. Most important of all, Crane wrung major wage concessions from the labor unions, all of which ended as Conrail prepared to go public.

With those things going for it, what made Conrail so imposing a player in the current transportation game was the Staggers Act of 1980. Staggers effectively deregulated railroad pricing for the first time since the turn of the century. The act was the government's long overdue recognition that the railroads' once-vaunted transportation monopoly was no more. Costs and competition would henceforward determine the industry's price structure. The impact of that act turned the industry upside down.

For one thing, the Staggers Act permitted a railroad to cancel the joint rates it had with connecting railroads if it couldn't make money on them. That's a matter of no small importance, considering that half of a railroad's business may be interchanged with somebody else's.

In the old days, as Crane explains, if you carried a shipment half the total distance, you got half the revenues—no matter whether you incurred half the costs. Conrail and its predecessors had complained for decades that, with its high terminal costs, it got the short end of the stick in dividing the revenues with other railroads. Staggers enabled Conrail to cancel joint rates right and left and reprice its service to cover costs. As former head of Southern, one of the offending connections, Crane knew where all the bodies were buried. "It wasn't rates that mattered, it was the divisions," Crane chortles. "That's where the money came from."

Regulations had also forced the railroads to equalize rates over all available routes between the same points regardless of cost. Staggers put an end to that as well. Conrail began setting its rates to reflect the cost of handling the business. If that meant some of its rates seemed prohibitively high, why, better not to carry something at all than to carry it at a loss.

Equally important, the railroads were for the first time free to offer contract rates, which now cover roughly 40% of Conrail's total traffic. Such rates were generally lower than regular rates, and they went to shippers who could guarantee certain volumes of traffic under certain conditions. This enabled both shippers and the railroads to plan—to spend money on things like equipment and terminals because the revenues to justify them were assured.

In going after the now booming stack-train business, for instance, Conrail could offer shippers like American President Cos. fixed rates for the service under long-term contracts. This, in turn, enabled American President to buy its own equipment for the double-stack service and Conrail to spend the money to increase railroad tunnel clearance to accommodate the double-stack cars.

Because contract rates are confidential, the railroads could also offer one rate to one customer and a different rate to another. "Such secrecy has allowed us to offer an individual shipper something we could never offer if we had to make it available everywhere." Here's an example of this new freedom in action.



One midwestern utility threatened that if Conrail didn't cut rates to one of its power plants, the utility would use the plant for peaking rather than for base load purposes. Such a move would have cut its coal needs sharply, but now Conrail had room to maneuver. Sooner than lose the traffic, Conrail cut its rates sharply in November—"more than I like to admit," Crane concedes—enabling it to keep the business.

For Conrail and the industry, deregulation hasn't meant an opportunity to raise rates at the customers' expense. Quite the contrary. Truck competition has been so fierce that on a 9.4% drop in revenue ton miles between 1981 and 1986, Conrail's total revenues dropped a disproportionate 11.6%. But Conrail's costs per revenue ton mile fell even faster, so that the traffic Conrail did carry was increasingly profitable. Without the ability to tailor prices and service and so undercut the competition, Crane says, the industry would never have survived the 1982 recession.

Deregulation, then, played a critical role in reestablishing Conrail's (and the industry's) competitiveness, enabling Conrail to emerge from government ownership last spring. The market quickly recognized what Crane had accomplished. Offered initially at 28, Conrail shares rose to a high of 40% before settling back after the October crash to around 29.

But now Congress threatens to undo all Crane has accomplished. Last fall a House subcommittee reported out a bill, the Consumer Rail Equity Act (HR 1393), that would effectively repeal Staggers. How? Let us count the ways. It would:

Force the railroads to establish joint rates;

Grant access to terminals and reciprocal switching arrangements at the request of any shipper or competing railroad;

Shift the burden of proof for the reasonableness of rates from the shipper to the railroads;

Pass through to shippers the cost savings resulting from improvements.

In short, HR 1393 would remove the very marketing tools that have been so effective in putting the industry back on its feet. "If you do away with Staggers, trucks will take all the business," Crane says. "There won't be revenues to support the railroads, and the industry will go bankrupt—not over the short term but the long term—and that's no exaggeration."

Does Crane seriously believe reregulation is a possibility? He does, and he's been stumping the country for months now trying to alert everyone involved to the danger.

Apocalypse aside, Crane sees plenty of reason for optimism. Last year, he says, turned out to be much better than anybody hoped. And he hopes to do about as well in 1988, especially since he's expected to retire at yearend. True, the auto and coal industries look softer than last year, but traffic otherwise looks promising, and truck competition seems likely to moderate a bit.

Conrail's a pure transportation operation, without any diversification at all, and its broadly balanced traffic base is rooted in the Northeast's traditional manufacturing economy. "The rust belt is coming back," Crane says. "No question about it. The steel industry has come back. USX is even reactivating their foreign sales organization, and they're going to start to export steel again. If we price ourselves properly and they don't reregulate us, we ought to be able to get our share of the business."

## JUSTICE FOR MERCHANT SEAMEN

### HON. JACK FIELDS

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. FIELDS. Mr. Speaker, I am pleased to submit for the RECORD today an outstanding editorial written by the highly distinguished columnist Mr. James J. Kilpatrick.

In his editorial, Mr. Kilpatrick applauds the recent decision of the Secretary of the Air Force to grant veterans status to our merchant mariners who served this Nation so courageously during World War II.

As someone who has long championed the cause of these forgotten men and who has cosponsored legislation to grant them veterans status, I am extremely pleased by this decision. In fact, my only regret is that it took more than 40 years to recognize the invaluable contributions of these brave Americans. Regrettably, because of this delay, many thousands of merchant mariners who served this nation with such distinction during World War II are no longer alive to receive the benefits and recognition they have so long deserved.

Mr. Speaker, these merchant mariners are the forgotten patriots of World War II and this Nation still owes them a great debt of gratitude. I am glad that even at this late hour our Government has finally made the right decision in granting them veterans status.

In addition, to the editorial by Mr. Kilpatrick, I am also submitting for the RECORD some of my previous remarks on this most important issue. I urge my colleagues to review this material and to join with me in complimenting the man who was instrumental in making this decision by the Secretary of the Air Force a reality—U.S. District Judge Louis F. Oberdorfer.

The text of these articles follows:

#### JUSTICE FOR MERCHANT SEAMEN

(By James J. Kilpatrick)

More than 40 years after the end of World War II, the merchant seamen who served so bravely in that conflict finally are to get the recognition that injustice so long has denied them. At last they are to be counted as veterans.

The decision has been a long time coming, but two weeks ago the Defense Department caved in. It will not appeal an order from U.S. District Judge Louis Oberdorfer granting surviving seamen the same rights and privileges that have been extended to other wartime civilian groups.

The court's order will have only limited effect, however. More than 250,000 merchant seamen served their country. It is thought that perhaps 70,000 to 80,000 of them are still alive, but they are beyond the age for such GI benefits as college tuition. A government witness conceded that the benefits now available to them will be mostly symbolic, "really minimal." Most of them will get "only a flag and a headstone" in a military cemetery.

The merchant seamen wrote a valiant chapter in the history of warfare at sea. More than a year before Pearl Harbor, the Coast Guard began training merchant seamen in gunnery and other military subjects. In October 1941, President Roosevelt lifted the ban on arming merchant ships:

they would be sailing "on missions connected with the defense of the United States."

With the outbreak of war, merchant seamen received additional military training. Shipping articles were changed so that seamen could be ordered "to such ports and places in any part of the world as may be ordered by the U.S. government." A War Shipping Administration took over the merchant ships for service consistent with "strategic military requirements."

The merchantmen then set about the dangerous business of transporting Army and Navy cargoes. The great majority of 7 million soldiers went overseas on merchant ships. "With this support," said Adm. William King, "the Navy could not have accomplished its mission."

For all practical purposes, the merchant steamers were under the Navy's control. Military authorities assigned their places in convoys, regulated shore leave for seamen and supervised discipline for misconduct. A seaman who attempted to resign was subject to court-martial.

Tantamount to military service, theirs was a harsh service indeed. In the first three months of the war, German U-boats sank 145 merchant ships in American coastal waters, killing 600 seamen. Over the entire war, Judge Oberdorfer noted, 5,662 merchant seamen lost their lives or were declared missing in action. More than 600 seamen became prisoners of war.

Other civilian groups also served in the war effort. Not until 1977 did Congress move tangibly to recognize their service. Sen. Barry Goldwater added an amendment to the GI Improvement Act making benefits available to the WASPs (Women's Air Forces Service Pilots), and it was expanded to include other groups that had received military training and were susceptible to assignment for duty in combat zones.

Veterans' benefits were extended to 14 groups, including female telephone operators in Europe, engineer field clerks, female stenographers with the American Expeditionary Force and "reconstruction aides and dietitians." The merchant seamen were repeatedly turned down, largely because of the dog-in-the-manger opposition of the regular Navy and such organizations as the American Legion. They complained that the civilian merchant seamen were paid better than enlisted sailors. In fact, as Judge Oberdorfer noted, studies found that their total remuneration "was approximately comparable."

President Roosevelt linked "the beleaguered men of the merchant marine" with our soldiers, sailors and pilots. They carried out "a vital part in this global war." So they did, and if it should cost the taxpayers a few million dollars for their medical care, grave-stones and flags, the money will be well spent.

#### MERCHANT MARINE SEAMEN DESERVE VETERANS BENEFITS

(By Congressman Jack Fields)

It's been more than 40 years since World War II ended. But some men who served in that war—men who helped free Europe, liberate the Philippines and defend the liberties which we Americans hold dear—still have not received the honors, benefits or rights they deserve. They are the merchant seamen who transported troops and war material from point to point during World War II. Regrettably, these brave men have become the forgotten patriots of World War II.

Unlike their brothers in uniform, America's merchant seamen came home to no ticker-tape parades, no celebrations. Little, if anything, was said about the contributions they made to defeating the Axis powers, to keeping Europe free, and to preserving the freedoms and liberties we Americans cherish. Worse, these merchant seamen came home to none of the veterans benefits enjoyed by the men and women who served America in uniform.

Legislation now has been proposed in Congress (H.R. 4709) which would grant veterans status to the merchant seamen of World War II. As an original cosponsor of this much-needed legislation, I hope the House Veterans Affairs Committee, the House Merchant Marine and Fisheries Committee and the full House will act favorably on this important proposal this year.

Indeed, the men who served in America's merchant marine during World War II have every reason to feel neglected by the country they helped defend.

We know that 168,000 merchant seamen helped to deliver troops and war material to every Allied invasion site from Guadalcanal to Omaha Beach. General Douglas MacArthur said that "the merchant seamen participating in the liberation of the Philippines shared the heaviest enemy fire. They . . . contributed tremendously to our success." The price they paid to keep us free was heavy: 569 U.S. merchant ships were destroyed; 6,632 seamen were killed; and 609 merchant mariners were taken as prisoners of war.

Indeed, the casualty rate for merchant seamen was second only to that of the U.S. Marine Corps during World War II.

In recognition of their efforts, President Roosevelt noted that they were men who "returned to their jobs at sea again and again, because they realized that the lifelines to our battlefronts would be broken if they did not carry out their vital part in this global war." But despite President Eisenhower's stated hope that America's merchant mariners' efforts in the war would long be remembered, the contributions made to winning the war by these brave men was all too readily forgotten.

Whether by bureaucratic incompetence or petty jealousy, our government's treatment of these brave merchant mariners has been regrettable. While the Department of Defense's Civilian Military Service Review Board made a small step in the right direction by granting veterans status to a group of merchant seamen who participated in the Normandy Invasion of 1944 (Operation Mulberry), the Board failed to adequately justify why two other groups of merchant seamen were not entitled to receive veterans status.

The Review Board arbitrarily chose to ignore two critical factors in their cases:

First, the Director of the Selective Service, General Lewis Hershey, instructed all draft boards throughout the country that "Service in the merchant marine . . . is so closely allied to service in the armed forces that men found by the local board to be actively engaged at sea may well be considered as engaged in active defense of the country. Such service may properly be considered as tantamount to military service."

And second, all merchant marine ships were painted wartime gray and all identifying marks were removed. In short, there was simply no way to distinguish between a merchant ship and an armed naval vessel. Because the merchant ships operated under military control, they were considered by

the enemy to be military targets. The civilians on board, therefore, lost their immunity from deliberate and direct attack.

I believe that the men of the oceangoing U.S. merchant marine of World War II earned the veterans status and veterans benefits which the Congress only now is considering granting them. The elimination of this injustice will not be complete until all the merchant seamen of World War II, not just those who participated in Operation Mulberry, receive veterans status.

We must end the distinction of being the only nation in the world that does not recognize its merchant marine on an equal basis with its military service personnel during time of war. It is time that we finally enacted legislation, first proposed by President Roosevelt, to extend veterans benefits to these highly deserving an incredibly patient merchant mariners. Even at this late hour, we can and we must right this wrong which has existed for too long.

Gene DeFries, president of the Marine Engineers Beneficial Association recently addressed the need to accord veteran status to the merchant seamen of World War II. In his National Maritime Day speech, Mr. DeFries noted that "these merchant seamen are men who passed the test, a greater test than most have ever been called upon to face. These are men who went to sea. They are not arm-chair warriors. They are not 'Rambo's' who have never seen the face of war. These are men of true courage. These are men who deserve our thanks, deserve our support and above all, deserve our honor."

They also are men who deserve veterans status and veterans benefits. I intend to continue to work to ensure that that goal becomes a reality as soon as possible.

## MEESE OUGHT TO QUIT

### HON. HAROLD E. FORD

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. FORD of Tennessee. Mr. Speaker, I rose on December 17, 1987, to speak about the responsibility of Edwin Meese to resign from his position as Attorney General. I rise again today to share with my colleagues an editorial which appeared in the largest daily newspaper in the Memphis area, *The Commercial Appeal*, on December 26, 1987. This editorial, merely one among many that have called for Meese to resign, asks the question, "What will it take for Attorney Edwin Meese to resign and stop embarrassing his President and his country?" As his web of dishonesty and improper conduct further entangles him, it remains a cogent question.

The article follows:

[From *The Commercial Appeal*, Dec. 26, 1987]

## MEESE OUGHT TO QUIT

What will it take for Attorney General Edwin Meese to resign and stop embarrassing his President and his country?

He has been under various clouds since he was nominated to be the nation's top legal officer. He has been investigated by two special prosecutors, with the latest probe still in progress.

The other day, two of Meese's friends and associates were indicted in the burgeoning scandal involving the Wedtech Corp., a New

York defense contractor. The pair—E. Robert Wallach and W. Franklyn Chinn—were accused, along with a third man, of extracting payoffs from Wedtech for influencing Meese and other federal officials.

Special prosecutor James McKay said there was "insufficient evidence as of this date" to charge Meese with criminal involvement in the Wedtech case. But he said he will continue to investigate the attorney general in connection with Wedtech and other unspecified matters. Meese has acknowledged interceding for Wedtech in 1982, when he was still a White House counselor and the company was trying to win an Army contract.

Recently some apparent irregularities were disclosed in a blind trust established by Meese. The trust has earned him considerable money. According to his financial disclosure forms, the trust's investment manager—Chinn—had bought and sold stock worth far more than the \$55,000 Meese had in trust accounts. Meese said he didn't know where the extra funds came from, and Chinn had declined to shed any light on the matter because of his Wedtech legal problems.

Meese was severely criticized last month by the Senate-House committee that investigated the Iran-contra affair. Its majority report accused him of being less than diligent in pursuing the matter in its initial phases and of giving President Reagan bad advice about how to respond to it. The panel said the President was "poorly served" by the attorney general.

Meese also has been criticized for giving Reagan poor advice on the nomination of Douglas Ginsburg to the Supreme Court. Ginsburg withdrew his name after it was revealed that he had used marijuana while a law professor.

The Wedtech probe and trials will drag on for months, and Meese's name no doubt will be associated with it at every step. The Reagan administration hardly needs such publicity during its last year. Meese ought to do the right thing and bow out.

## A SUCCESSFUL FORUM ON DRUG ABUSE

### HON. J. DENNIS HASTERT

OF ILLINOIS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. HASTERT. Mr. Speaker, last week, I invited two students from each junior high and senior high school in my district to join me for a Youth Forum on Drugs.

More than 250 students attended the event and we had a very productive discussion of why there is a drug and alcohol abuse problem among our teenagers and heard some very valuable recommendations on what we, as adults, can take to find solutions.

I was fortunate to have my colleague, Congressman FRED GRANDY, of Iowa, join me in moderating this debate. I also assembled a panel of experts from my district who joined in our discussions.

Shortly after taking office last year, I established a special task force on drug and alcohol abuse to advise me on steps we could take in Washington and Illinois to deal with this pervasive problem. One of their first projects was to compile a directory of social



agencies and other groups who can assist in dealing with these problems. The second project was to sponsor this forum.

Centel Cable Television, which serves a large portion of my district, taped the event and will show it on their system. In addition, copies of the tape will be available to schools and social service agencies to use in their drug programs.

One of the surprises of this event, I'll admit, is the willingness of our young people to talk about this problem and to offer solutions. I am considering making this forum an annual event and I would highly recommend it to my colleagues.

Mr. Speaker I would like to share with you the news report of the forum from the Naperville Sun. It captures well the focus of the event:

[From the Naperville Sun, Jan. 27, 1988]  
A SUCCESSFUL FORUM ON DRUG ABUSE  
(By Pat Raab)

Teenagers had a lot to say Monday about drug and alcohol abuse among their peers.

They talked about the effect of television programs that seem to glamorize drinking.

They asked why funding had been cut for such successful programs as In-Touch.

And questioned the mixed messages adults give on drinking and drugs.

They also told adults that the "push, push and cure you" approach to treating drug and alcohol abuse isn't successful because it doesn't deal with the reasons why kids turn to alcohol and drugs in the first place.

The more than 250 high school and middle school representatives who attended the Congressional Forum on Drugs and Alcohol Abuse, represented 54 schools in the 14th Congressional District. The forum was sponsored by Congressman Dennis Hastert (R-14). Assisting him was Congressman Fred Grandy of Iowa. Both serve on the House Select Committee on Children, Youth and Families.

The forum was held at the Illinois Math and Science Academy in Aurora.

Grandy, who played Gopher on the popular television series *Love Boat*, said he had a personal interest in drug abuse programs. Recalling his friend Lauren Tewes, who played Julie, the cruise director on the show, Grandy said, "she lost everything," because of her cocaine addiction.

Grandy urged the students to reach out and help each other get off drugs. "Without friends, you don't get anywhere," he said, "and you don't get off drugs. I wish I'd done that earlier to a friend," he said.

Besides Grandy, students also heard from a panel that included a district attorney, police department youth aid officer, a student leader, parent group leader, addiction counselor and a professional soccer player.

Hastert said government could make it tough on drug suppliers, but as long as there is still a demand, the problem won't go away.

"How big is the problem?" he asked.

Citing national statistics that drug use is on the decline, he also cited reports that showed alcohol use continues to be the drug of choice for students.

Bill Johnson, an addiction counselor in LaSalle County, said solving the problem of alcohol abuse means you have to admit alcohol is a problem.

Anne Meyer, president-elect of the National Federation of Parents for a Drug Free Youth, said marijuana use has apparently leveled off; cocaine use is down, but al-

cohol use is increasing, starting at even younger age levels.

Johnson said alcohol is an across-the-board problem with abusers. Most started with alcohol, he said, and although they may turn to other drugs, they usually continue to use alcohol.

Dave Hilderbrand of the Naperville Police Department Youth Bureau said teens "long to belong." He challenged the students to turn to their friends and classmates to "give them guidance. It will make a difference," he promised.

Juan Thomas, an Aurora West High School senior and president of the Illinois Assn. of Student Councils, added a teenager's perspective to the panel. He said a lot of his classmates probably would not be into drugs if they were involved in something.

Thomas said he was headed for trouble in elementary and middle school. But when he got to high school, someone asked him to run for Student Council. That involvement "gets me high, but won't get me killed," he said frankly.

"Every kid wants to belong to something," he said. If they find something to challenge their talents, they usually won't get sidetracked into drugs, he said. Those who choose drugs just haven't found a niche, he said. "It's that type of loneliness and insecurity that makes them go use drugs," he said.

Teddy Kraft, who was born in Poland and is now a West German citizen, is a forward/midfielder with the Chicago Sting professional soccer team. An active member of STOP, Sports Teams Organized for the Prevention of Drug Abuse, he said he couldn't get anywhere professionally if he used drugs.

But it was the 250 students in the audience who had the loudest messages.

One student, from LaSalle-Peru, wondered why some parents supply alcohol for their children's parties.

In response, Mrs. Meyer challenged the students to turn the tables and organize programs to educate parents on alcohol and drug abuse.

A DeKalb County student athlete observed that substance abuse among professional athletes was "disturbing" to young athletes, but, he added, "there are always Walter Paytons to look up to."

A student from LaSalle-Peru, complained that funding for the In-Touch program had been cut.

Problems often become crazes, Grandy said. When people move on to the next craze, the funding often moves too. He told the students they were not too young to lobby for programs they considered important.

A student from Dundee asked how anti-alcohol and drug programs could be effective when drinking is portrayed on national television as glamorous.

Mrs. Meyer recalled that cigarette advertisers had been challenged to present one health ad for every five cigarette ads aired. Cigarette ads were not banned from TV, she said, but within 30 days for the five-for-one rule, cigarette advertisers dropped their ads.

"We can do the same thing with alcohol, and I think we should," she said.

Juan Thomas said students needed to recognize that TV programs are not real life. "We have to be able to watch TV and know that they're not the way it is," he said.

Those messages can be countered at the local level, Grandy said. Short of regulating all programming which would tread on freedom of speech, Grandy suggested that local programs could counter those less desirable messages.

"Counter a message with a better message," he said.

An East Aurora student was worried about the "slap their hands and let them go," approach in the courts that gives kids the idea they can do what they want and they'll get off.

She also said students don't want to go for help because "people want to push, push and cure you right now. But it still doesn't stop the reasons why kids started" abusing drugs in the first place, she observed.

An Addison High School student questioned the contracts student athletes sign promising not to use drugs or alcohol. Athletes ignore those contracts, she said, but the school doesn't invoke the penalties.

Juan Thomas recalled a downstate Illinois school where the varsity team was suspended for drinking and the sophomores played the next game. That changed a lot of minds in a hurry, he said. They decided they'd better "cool it," and they did, he said.

"We need tougher enforcement by school administrators," Thomas said.

Mrs. Meyer suggested that students who are concerned about possible double standard for athletes should voice their concerns to school administrators and the athletic director. "It can be done," she said about getting tougher adherence to school rules. "It takes a lot of courage (to go to the principal)" she said, "and don't go alone."

A Marmion Military Academy student said kids put too much pressure on themselves to succeed. When they fall short, they tend to blame adults. Then, in rebellion, they turn to drugs and alcohol, he said.

When adults are critical of kids, it makes them want to get back at adults.

Kids need to have goals and ambitions, he said.

Being involved, winning a game, acting in a play are all "natural highs," Grandy and others said. But the higher you push yourself, the greater the fall, cautioned Grandy. Playing a good game and giving a good performance should be enough, he said.

Let a natural high of achievement be enough, Grandy said.

And, "don't underestimate your ability to lead," he told the students.

## A TRIBUTE TO SALA BURTON

### HON. NANCY PELOSI

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Ms. PELOSI. Mr. Speaker, it was just a year ago this week that we lost our dear friend, former Congresswoman Sala Burton.

Sala's interest in politics was born out of her early years in Poland and I heard her say many times, "I saw and felt what was happening in Western Europe when the Nazis were moving in. You learn that politics is everybody's business." No one understood that more clearly or felt that more strongly than our friend Sala.

After Phillip's death, Sala continued the Burton legacy in Congress and, as many of you will recall, she was very persuasive and effective in this role. It was a bittersweet experience for me to join you following Sala's death and on the occasion of my swearing in, I stated that I would change the circumstances under which I came to Congress if I

could. I wish Phillip were here; I wish Sala were here. But they are not and it is my duty to the people of the Fifth District of California to continue their history of excellence, commitment and of making government work for people.

Phil and Sala Burton may have differed in style, but their political beliefs were uniquely wedded in a tradition of caring for people and understanding human concerns outside their own set of experiences. They were a magnificent team.

We will never forget that Sala once graced these Halls and that she added something very special to our lives.

#### THE 1988 AGENDA

### HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Washington Report for Wednesday, February 3, 1988, into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

#### THE 1988 AGENDA

In his State of the Union address last Monday, President Reagan set out his agenda for his final year in the White House. There is always a thrill to a State of the Union address. It is impressive to see the President, the Vice President, Supreme Court justices, members of the Senate and the House, the President's cabinet, the military leadership of the nation, and the diplomatic corps all assembled in a single room. The news media and other spectators fill the galleries to standing room only. The entire atmosphere is charged, even though State of the Union addresses are largely predictable.

The central message of the President's address was that his domestic agenda is largely completed. His ability to control the domestic agenda has diminished as the nation turns toward a presidential election. He still has considerable power in blocking those things he does not want the Congress to pass, such as a protectionist trade bill or an increase in the minimum wage. He retains enormous influence in foreign affairs, and the things he emphasized in his State of the Union address—ratification of the Intermediate-range Nuclear Forces (INF) Treaty and support of the Contras in Nicaragua—involve foreign affairs.

There was little in his State of the Union address to suggest that the President will be pushing hard on defense, tax, or other items on the domestic agenda. The speech did not contain any new domestic initiatives or surprises. The President recited a familiar list of bills he wanted: the line-item veto, the balanced budget amendment, school prayer, and a ban on abortions. There was no sense of urgency or challenge in the President's presentation, and I do not think he dispelled the general impression in the Congress that he is largely marking time in his final year.

President Reagan correctly criticized the Congress for its reliance on omnibus bills—lumping together most of the government's fiscal agenda into a few massive catchall bills. This was a procedure developed by David Stockman and the President early in his administration to get controversial items passed by putting them into enormous

"must-pass" bills. My sense is that the Congress will make a serious effort this year to pass the major appropriations bills individually, aided by last year's budget summit which settled many disputes in advance.

Administration officials readily admit that most of the opportunities for the President this year are in foreign policy, where his powers are broad. Members of Congress have also noted that the White House is emphasizing foreign affairs in the President's own schedule. The President is scheduled to make at least four foreign trips by the middle of this year, to Mexico, Belgium, Canada, and the Soviet Union.

The major issues before the Congress this year may not include several of those mentioned in the President's State of the Union address, but rather legislation already in the pipeline. The looming federal budget deficit—some \$46 billion over the \$136 billion Gramm-Rudman deficit target—will color all of the Congress' efforts this year. Major items on the agenda include:

**Health.**—The question of cost containment and effectiveness will be especially noticeable in health care issues. The Congress will consider long-term and nursing home care as well as the problem of financing health care for those inadequately protected. It will try to complete action on an expansion of Medicare to provide catastrophic health insurance. At the same time, the Congress will have to enact further cost containment measures to restrain federal outlays for Medicare and Medicaid.

**Defense.**—Defense policy will also be guided by deficit reduction guidelines, with the Congress and the President agreeing to a fiscal year 1989 defense spending limit of \$299.5 billion. For the fourth straight year, this would keep defense spending increases below the inflation rate. Funding for the President's Strategic Defense Initiative will be a prominent concern, as will be efforts to guide the Pentagon's adjustment to new fiscal realities. The Congress is also likely to continue efforts to strengthen defense readiness and conventional forces.

**Welfare.**—Last year's major push to reform the welfare system was not completed in the first session. Welfare reform has concentrated on requiring work, training, and education programs to get families off welfare and into jobs. The Senate may consider a more moderate version of the \$5 billion, five-year plan passed by the House.

**Trade.**—The prospects for controversial trade and competitiveness bills passed by the House and the Senate are unclear at present. A slight easing of the trade deficit in recent months, due to the plummeting of the dollar in international markets, may reduce pressure to legislate changes. The Congress may still act to force foreign countries to end unfair trade practices against US products. Congressional ratification of the US-Canadian Free Trade Agreement is expected.

**Environment.**—Efforts to strengthen the Clean Air Act will continue in 1988. At issue are what to do about the nearly 100 areas which fail to meet the August 1988 air pollution deadline and how to address the problem of acid rain control. Other environmental issues include groundwater protection and municipal waste disposal.

**Foreign policy.**—A critical vote on continued aid for the Nicaraguan Contras will occur in early February. Close evaluation of progress in the Central American peace process will be of equal concern to congressional observers. Perhaps the key foreign policy question will be how to respond to

the new Soviet initiatives and arms control proposals. Senate ratification of the INF Treaty is expected. With little action by the President to spur the peace process in the Middle East, the Congress will assess the mounting tensions and hostilities in the region.

It is always hard to predict what the Congress will accomplish during the year, but my guess is that 1988 will be largely devoted to completing unfinished legislation from last year. The Congress this session will again be dominated by the tough question of how to pay for what it wants to do.

#### DOUG WILLIAMS' TRIUMPH

### HON. WILLIAM (BILL) CLAY

OF MISSOURI

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. CLAY. Mr. Speaker, this past week, the political issues which ordinarily dominate the news in and about Washington were overshadowed by the excitement surrounding the Washington Redskins. The Redskins Super Bowl victory created a rare spirit of Washington nationalism among a citizenry more customarily divided by hometown allegiance.

But as all the temporary, transplanted and native Washingtonians join to celebrate the Redskins victory, I remind all football fans to take time out to acknowledge the special contribution of Doug Williams, the first black quarterback to play in a Super Bowl contest.

Black American athletes have fought a long, uphill struggle to participate in professional sports. Williams' triumphant performance at the 1988 Super Bowl is an important achievement in sports history, and will be recorded as another turning point in the history of professional black athletes. In this spirit, I am happy to share an outstanding article from the Washington Post, February 2, 1988, in which Juan Williams highlights the struggles and the achievements of black athletes on football fields across our Nation.

#### DOUG WILLIAMS' TRIUMPH

(By Juan Williams)

Doug Williams' Super Bowl performance goes in the record book under his name alone. But when he played hurt, when he proved himself a leader after his team was down by 10 points and when he threw for four touchdowns, Doug Williams was also playing and proving something for generations of black American men who dreamed and tried, but were denied the chance to play quarterback in the NFL.

We should be clear about this; being black did not get Williams to the Super Bowl. It did not give him the ability or the smarts to bring a championship to Washington. And it was not comfort to him during the ups and downs of his career and even this soap opera of a football season. In that sense, Williams' blackness has nothing to do with his success and the Redskins' magnificent victory.

But being black has been enough to keep players away from the quarterback position for most of pro football's history. Blacks could play linebacker, defensive back or running back—but not quarterback. They could go to Canada to play quarterback. They could quit in frustration if they insisted on being a quarterback and heard that they



really weren't very good, which is what some sportswriters were saying about Doug Williams until Sunday's performance.

That's why Williams' triumph goes beyond Doug Williams and beyond the Redskins' burgundy and gold. His victory is not in being the first black football player. It did not come from his being the first black quarterback or the first black to be a good quarterback. Other black men used up their careers and dreams knocking down those walls—they were Doug Williams' lead blockers. And when Doug Williams played in the Super Bowl they played with him.

They include such men as the aptly named Willie Thriver, who was signed by the Chicago Bears 35 years ago as the first black quarterback. He threw only eight passes before having his contract canceled, and he went to the Canadian leagues to play. And there was also Marlin Briscoe. In his rookie season, 1968, Briscoe was the starting quarterback, ironically, for the Denver Broncos. He had a good year—14 touchdown passes in 11 games. But he was inexplicably waived off the team. He then signed with the Buffalo Bills, for whom he was not allowed to play quarterback but did become an all-pro receiver.

Also in the backfield with Doug Williams was Eddie Robinson, the legendary football coach, who once trained a black player specifically for the NFL's drop-back quarterback style. Robinson wanted to force the league's general managers to draft a black quarterback and play him at quarterback. But when draft day came several general managers asked Robinson and the player, James Harris, if he would agree to play another position. Harris said no. As a result, a man with four years of experience as a quarterback in the NFL's system was not drafted until the eighth round; he was so despondent that Coach Robinson had to persuade him to report to the Buffalo Bills.

Harris had some success as he played sporadically with three teams over 12 years. His achievement was staying in the big leagues as a quarterback. He persevered in a segregated system: only nine black players have thrown 25 or more passes in the NFL since the mid-'60s, and one of them is a running back—Walter Payton.

Against that backdrop of history, Doug Williams' victory Sunday is like the winning play on a 99-yard drive put together by many people—most of whom are nowhere near the field when the points finally go up on the scoreboard. Doug Williams provided that winning play by routing out the Broncos and also routing the last of the lies and blasphemies that gave support to the belief that black quarterbacks can't win in the big time. He won the biggest of the big games.

His performance is the ultimate answer to a Tampa Bay team that currently pays a rookie quarterback several million dollars to sit on the bench and learn how to be an NFL leader. Only a few years back, Tampa gave a black rookie quarterback named Doug Williams a small contract and insisted that he prove immediately that he could play in the NFL. Breaking through these negative assumptions about blacks—that they aren't smart enough to quarterback or can't inspire other players and must prove themselves at once—is all part of Williams' Super Bowl victory.

At some level, maybe not a conscious level, white owners and coaches for decades did not want black players to have the leading role on the great American stage called the football field. Football is an enormous part of American culture and arguably the main

cultural sanctuary of American males. The quarterback is the glamorous figure in that culture—he is the field general and every cheerleader's dream date. Coaches have found quarterback-leadership potential in wild guys such as Billy Kilmer and even not-so-smart guys such as Terry Bradshaw. But somehow they never found that leadership potential in black players.

Joe Gibbs—to his credit—had no trouble seeing Doug Williams as a leader and a talent. Gibbs' trust in Williams for the big game is radical and new. It flies in the face of all the backroom stereotypes about blacks not being brainy enough or tough enough to quarterback the big games. Gibbs ignored such talk.

That is where Gibbs and Williams have created a modern race-relations breakthrough by going where football and another male culture—American corporate life—have never been before. Gibbs entrusted Williams with the company's greatest aspiration—to win the Super Bowl—despite all the years of negative stereotypes about any black who sought to lead his team. Doug Williams went into the game as a black player who is no role player and no token player. He is simply the best quarterback the Redskins have, and they gave him the chance to lead, which he did with class. And he won.

That's why his victory is a breakthrough—a dream come true for so many more than Redskins' fans.

#### TRIBUTE TO MARVIN BARRISH

##### HON. ROBERT A. BORSKI

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. BORSKI. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to Mr. Marvin Barrish, a resident of Northeast Philadelphia known as the dancing newsboy.

Though Marvin Barrish has been confined to a wheelchair since 1980, he continues to dance to inspire the handicapped and raise funds for charitable organizations.

Marvin was known as one of the best dancers of the 1950's. His dancing career began at age 3 when he would dance at his mother's newsstand at 19th and Walnut Streets in Philadelphia. It progressed through appearances at the Steel Pier in Atlantic City, on local television shows and even in the movie "Rocky II." When he lost the use of his legs, it looked like Marvin's dancing career was over.

Now, however, Marvin is again a celebrity as a dancer. He has done his wheelchair dance at the Spectrum at halftime of a Villanova basketball game and at the Special Olympics at Franklin Field and J.F.K. Stadium. Marvin has helped raise funds for the Variety Club, Children's Hospital, Shriner's Hospital, Spina Bifida Foundation, the Vietnam Memorial Fund and many other worthy causes.

Marvin Barrish has been commended by the Philadelphia City Council, the Pennsylvania State House and Senate. I join those who have already honored Marvin, and I pay tribute to his courage, effort, and inspiration.

#### SALUTE TO INTERNATIONAL UNDERSTANDING

##### HON. RONALD D. COLEMAN

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. COLEMAN of Texas. Mr. Speaker, Fort Bliss, TX, is the home of the air defense training school for the Air Force of the Federal Republic of Germany. Col. Karl E. Wallrath, commandant of the German Air Force Air Defense School, will return soon to Germany after 4 years at this command. I would like my colleagues to join me in recognizing his outstanding service to his country to promote friendship with the city of El Paso and the people of the United States.

Colonel Wallrath has held various posts in the United States as an officer of the German Armed Forces beginning in 1959. Approximately 9 years of his military career has been spent at Fort Bliss. He is the recipient of the U.S. Army Commendation Medal, the German Armed Forces Commendation Cross, and the German Sports Medal.

As commandant, Colonel Wallrath has served as a liaison to Fort Bliss and the city of El Paso. He has hosted numerous Government officials and business leaders through exchange programs between our two countries. He was instrumental in organizing a host family program for German officers stationed in El Paso, and promoted many German cultural events that contributed to the international flavor of El Paso. He was active in numerous civic organizations in El Paso.

Colonel Wallrath is married to Anna-Helene Wallrath, and they have one son. Mrs. Wallrath was also active in civic affairs, including participation in the El Paso Chamber of Commerce; Hospice of El Paso, the El Paso Foster Parent Association, and the Lighthouse for the Blind. In addition, she worked closely with several orphanages in Ciudad Juarez, Chihuahua, Mexico.

Colonel and Mrs. Wallrath have contributed to international understanding and good will during their stay in El Paso and the United States. I am honored to have had the opportunity to work with them, and I wish them well in all their future endeavors.

#### IN MEMORY OF PAUL MARION FIRICA

##### HON. J.J. PICKLE

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. PICKLE. Mr. Speaker, the saga of Paul Firica is a miracle of our times. Like a meteor which flashed across the skies of central Texas—and the Nation—his brief time has illuminated our hearts.

Paul Firica was different. Unlike a lot of people who accept their lot in life, Paul Firica decided to do something about it. In 1985, he walked off his Romanian ship and sought the asylum and the waiting protection of a free people in the United States. Unfortunately,

Paul Firica died of lung cancer at the age of 46 on January 1, 1988.

I don't think Paul Firica wanted to be, or tried to be, a hero. He sought no headlines, he contacted no newspapers or television networks. But he knew what he did want: He wanted to be free, to live in a completely free society. And this same desire is perhaps the strongest urge of all people for thousands of years. It is the same desire that has toppled empires, destroyed kings and kingdoms, and brought down dictators whenever those governments forgot the rights of people. For Paul Firica, it was his desire to come to this new land and see if this country could give him help and hope. The community of Austin, TX—and particularly the Central Assembly of God Church—has done that. The congregation, the caring leadership of Rev. Tom Wilson, opened its heart to Paul and his family.

We must not forget this readjustment is a typical American tradition. The United States, for our 215 years, has been the one open society for all the nations of the world. Remember, we are a diverse people. We, or our ancestors, came to America. Few of our families are native in the true sense. Our ancestors came here, like Paul, propelled by the same desire that propelled Paul off his ship at great risk.

Perhaps for no other reason than to remind us of our heritage, Paul Firica's life has special meaning. To all of us, he has given assurance that men and women can change their lives and, with God's help, can rekindle the flame of independence that burns deep inside each of us. Though his life's duration with us was short, we know he has aroused the pride and spirit of hundreds of people in central Texas. He has been our special friend. Austin has been proud to have him as a resident. The church loved him like a brother. He was different, and he made a difference. We do not know why Paul was taken from our midst anymore than we did not know why he was sent to us in the first place. Right now, it is simply the time to pay our respects to this brave soul.

Government plays a key rule in the destiny of men. Government should be both the protector and guardian of the rights of individuals, so that each person has the opportunity and right to pursue his goals as a person created by God and endowed with certain rights. When any government violates or neglects to guarantee those rights, then that government will be held accountable by the people who have bestowed that right in the first place.

This is the message our Founding Fathers proclaimed. We, the people, must prevail. A violation of these rights—by any nation, no matter what its ideology, will eventually bring about its own destruction. And when those rights are abused, people will rebel—or flee.

That is what Paul Firica believed. That is what caused him to choose to live his life in America. That is why his church chose to adopt him and his family. His life with us has renewed our faith in the goodness of people everywhere.

## DEMOCRACY, DEBT, AND ECONOMIC GROWTH: ISSUES FOR THE UNITED STATES IN LATIN AMERICA

HON. LEE H. HAMILTON

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. HAMILTON. Mr. Speaker, I would like to insert my Foreign Affairs Newsletter for February 1988 into the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD:

### DEMOCRACY, DEBT, AND ECONOMIC GROWTH: ISSUES FOR THE UNITED STATES IN LATIN AMERICA

There is trouble in Latin America and the U.S. is not paying enough attention to it. Many democracies have emerged in Latin America over the past decade, but they are fragile. They face serious social and political problems because of the prolonged economic crisis that has gripped the region since 1982. Nearly all face large and growing external debts. These and other problems—including the drug trade in Colombia, military revolt in Argentina, guerrilla war in Peru, political paralysis and 900% inflation in Brazil—increase the appeal of extremism and the dangers of instability. Many Latin Americans are dissatisfied and apprehensive.

I am impressed with the contrasting views of U.S. and Latin American leaders. The Administration speaks of the "resurgence of democracy" in Latin America. It believes debt problems are being overcome and that market-oriented economies in the region are getting stronger. It assesses the U.S. relationship with Latin America with satisfaction, even complacency. Latin American leaders, however, are worried and disillusioned. They think the U.S. is obsessed with communism in Central America, has not provided effective economic leadership, especially on debt matters, and has set a poor example by running huge budget deficits which contribute to higher interest rates. They worry about debt, poverty, unemployment and income inequality, and do not share our fixation with Nicaragua, which comprises less than 1% of the population of Latin America. These different views leave the impression that U.S. and Latin American leaders are looking at different continents. My sense is that Latin American leaders are disappointed in U.S. leadership, especially on economic issues, and that U.S. influence in the Americas is eroding.

We simply must be more attentive to Latin America. Several urgent international problems—drugs, immigration, terrorism, and protection of the environment—cannot be solved without help from Latin America. Our central concern is whether democracy in the region will endure. If elected governments fail to address economic and social ills, opportunists will push for radical policies and armed forces may intervene.

Latin Americans themselves must consolidate democracy, but the U.S. and the international community can help. The U.S. should continue to assist the development of judicial, police and electoral systems, and to speak out in favor of a free press, fair elections and human rights. Fighting economic injustice and the drug trade through our aid programs can also help democracy.

Perhaps the biggest contribution to democracy in Latin America would be progress on the debt issue. The region's external debt is staggering. The biggest debtors—Brazil

(\$110 billion), Mexico (\$100 billion) and Argentina (\$52 billion)—are in the throes of economic crisis and repayment difficulties. Weakened by years of austerity, high inflation and unemployment, these governments fear political suicide if they make painful economic reforms or pay all their creditors. Eight countries in Latin America have declared a moratorium on interest payments, and most voluntary lending to the region has ceased. Starved for new investment, Latin American economies have been unable to resume growth.

Latin America has a strong influence on the U.S. economy. We need healthy economic partners in the region, both as a market for our exports and as a source of resources and products. But debt places a sharp constraint on their ability to import. U.S. exports to the region peaked in 1981 at \$42.1 billion, and have since declined by over 25%. This may have cost the U.S. 400,000 jobs.

Increasingly, Latin America has turned to the more open U.S. market to earn the income it needs to service debt. Since 1981 the U.S. share of Latin American exports to the industrial world has increased, and the U.S. trade balance with Latin America, a \$1.3 billion surplus in 1981, is now a large deficit. Nonetheless, total Latin American exports are stagnating, and the level of Latin debt has increased since 1982 from \$325 billion to \$400 billion. New approaches must be found:

Industrial countries must work to reduce interest rates and expand trade. Europe and Japan especially must open their markets to more Latin American goods;

Some negotiated agreement between debtors and creditors is required. As the U.S. now acknowledges, full debt service is unlikely. New approaches, including Mexico's plan to guarantee payment of written-down loans, should be explored;

The U.S., Europe and Japan must work to provide new resources to the region through international financial institutions and foreign investment; and

Latin American economic reform is the most important step to spur new growth. Latin governments need to reduce public sector deficits, sell inefficient state enterprises, strengthen private sectors, attract foreign capital, expand savings and investment, and promote exports.

More effective U.S. policies on debt, trade, and economic growth can strengthen Latin America's democratic leaders. My impression is that they understand their problems, and recognize the burden of leadership to solve them. But they also need our understanding, respect and cooperation. Washington must respond to their problems positively, making Latin America a priority for U.S. foreign policy, and with a recognition that Latin American countries are prepared to be active partners in solving shared problems.

My feeling is that the U.S. is missing opportunities for inter-American cooperation because of our focus on Nicaragua. Washington cannot make Latin America safe for democracy, and it may not be able to provide billions of dollars in aid. It may no longer dominate Latin America, but it remains an important actor in the region. Through cooperative measures Washington can help the region confront its pressing problems.



# TRIBUTE TO SAM GREENBERG

## HON. HOWARD L. BERMAN

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. BERMAN. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to pay tribute to a truly outstanding member of my community, Mr. Sam Greenberg. Sam has been an active member of the San Fernando Valley Association for the Retarded for more than 30 years. On February 6, the association will honor him for his work and dedication to its worthy cause.

Sam Greenberg has been an integral part of the San Fernando Valley community for more than 50 years. Having grown up in Van Nuys, he returned there after graduating from the University of California, Berkeley. As the owner of Sam's U Drive, he was known throughout his community as a tough businessman. Sam also served as a commissioner for the city of Los Angeles Department of Airports and has been an active member of the National Rental Association.

Although Sam has been involved with many philanthropic organizations, he considers the San Fernando Valley Association for the Retarded his "pet charity." His generosity toward this organization stems from a sincere desire to help those who were born retarded. In fact, Sam's concern for these individuals has been a key factor in the survival of the association. Over the years, he has provided the organization with contributions, memorial grants and equipment necessary for its operation. In 1974, Sam's generosity enabled the association to build a new rehabilitation facility more than three times larger than its previous one. Two years ago, Sam established a \$450,000 matching fund to help build the Continuing Action for Food Service Education Building [CAFE]. The association is determined to meet this challenge and is now in the last stages of raising the necessary funds. Once completed, this new building will offer the retarded citizens of our community a place to lead more productive and fulfilling lives.

Sam, together with his late beloved wife Helen, unselfishly devoted their time and energy to improve the quality of life for the residents of the San Fernando Valley. He has diligently continued their work for the betterment of the community.

It is my honor and pleasure to join my colleagues and the San Fernando Valley Association for the Retarded in honoring Sam Greenberg for his generosity and dedication toward the retarded and those serve them.

# A TRIBUTE TO MAE BOREN AXTON

## HON. BART GORDON

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. GORDON. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to salute an outstanding American, Mae Boren Axton, of Hendersonville, TN, a songwriter, journalist, activist, teacher, and, most importantly, a humanitarian.

A very special event honoring her will be held February 15, 1988, in Nashville. In the true spirit of Mae Boren Axton, proceeds from this event will be given to the Spina Bifida Association of America. The most common disabling birth defect in America, spina bifida is caused by a defect in the spinal column of a developing fetus which damages the spinal cord. Mae Boren Axton's long involvement with the Spina Bifida Association is testimony to her humanistic ideals.

Mae Boren Axton is perhaps best known as coauthor of Elvis Presley's first million-selling record, "Heartbreak Hotel." This cemented her long association with the "King of Rock and Roll." She has since written or cowritten more than 200 songs that have been recorded by artists including Red Foley, Hank Snow, Feron Young, and Conway Twitty.

But Mae's accomplishments extend beyond the realm of songwriting. She has been the catalyst in the careers of numerous performers, songwriters, and business professionals. She discovered Willie Nelson in the State of Washington; publicized Johnny Tillotson; wrote the first article about Waylon Jennings; and took a young Jerry Reed into her home.

She has written countless articles for country music trade magazines, promotional stories, and album liners, and is the author of four books. The featured columnist for 15 years for Charlton Publications, publisher of magazines such as Hit Parader and Country Song Roundup, Mae has helped shape the destiny of country music and those who create it.

Hardworking and dedicated, Mae Boren Axton commends the respect of the music industry. As an activist, Mae successfully lobbied the Tennessee State legislature to combat tape piracy and copyright violations. She is an able force in the American political arena.

Mae Boren Axton, whose first career was teaching, is also the mother of two successful sons. John is a lawyer in Ada, OK. Hoyt is a songwriter and singer in his own right.

She has made real humanitarian contributions by coordinating benefits for Easter Seals, March of Dimes, United Way, Autistic Children, and Spina Bifida.

Mae Boren Axton has been honored as an Outstanding Tennessean; has received the Tex Ritter Award; was inducted into the Songwriter Hall of Fame and the Oklahoma Women's Hall of Fame; and has received seven BMI songwriting awards.

It is a pleasure to bring Mae Boren Axton's outstanding record of public service to the attention of my colleagues in the House of Representatives. I ask that they join me in paying tribute to her.

# THE COLORADO TECHNICAL COLLEGE

## HON. JOEL HEFLEY

OF COLORADO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. HEFLEY. Mr. Speaker, it is with great pleasure that I pay tribute to an outstanding institution of higher learning located in Colorado Springs, CO.

The Colorado Technical College (CTC) began as a one room classroom, radio and television repair school 21 years ago. In these few short years, this college has a \$2.5 million investment in an all-new campus, classrooms and laboratory equipment. Colorado Technical College will eventually provide 80,000 square feet of classroom, lab, office, and library resources. The college is committed to excellence and has invested heavily in state-of-the-art computer systems and electronics for classroom training.

CTC offers bachelor of science degrees in electrical engineering, electronic engineering technology, and computer science. Associate degrees are available in electronic engineering technology and biomedical engineering technology.

The college has significant success in placing its students after graduation. Industry hires over 95 percent of Colorado Tech's graduates within 3 months of receiving their degree.

It is an honor to acknowledge an institute that fills such a need in our community and I commend all those associated with its success.

# IT'S TIME TO SOLVE DALLAS POLICE-COMMUNITY RELATIONS PROBLEMS ON THE LOCAL LEVEL

## HON. MARTIN FROST

OF TEXAS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. FROST. Mr. Speaker, the events of the last week surrounding the death of Police Officer John Chase present a great challenge for the city of Dallas.

A year ago I joined with local black elected officials in urging a public airing of tensions between the minority community and the Dallas Police Department. A very constructive hearing, requested by the Dallas City Council, was conducted by the Criminal Justice Subcommittee of the House of Representatives in May which all sides had the opportunity to air their views.

The city council, under the leadership of Mayor Annette Strauss, is in the process of implementing many important reforms in city and police department policies to address the legitimate concerns voiced at the congressional hearing. These problems are being solved on a local level, and that's clearly the best possible approach.

The death of Officer Chase last Saturday was a tragedy. I attended Officer Chase's funeral in Des Moines yesterday and was deeply moved by the love and respect shown for him by everyone who knew him and by the law enforcement community.

There is a dispute over the degree to which any bystander last Saturday urged Officer Chase's mentally ill assailant to kill the officer. If this actually occurred, it is wrong, and anyone who took part in this action should be prosecuted. It is clear to me that if anyone really did urge the assailant to shoot Officer Chase, this does not represent the sentiment of the black community.

Dallas' black citizens respect authority every bit as much as its white citizens, and while they want improvements to be made in the police department, the black population of Dallas does not condone what happened last Saturday any more than the white population.

Statements made by Chief of Police Billy Prince, blaming local black officials for creating a climate that contributed to last Saturday's shooting, were not responsible. Councilmembers Al Libscomb and Diane Ragsdale have every right to raise questions about past police practices and to advocate changes in police policy to give Dallas a better police department.

The city council has responded in a very positive way during the last year, and the very important changes the city is making should not be obscured by the passion of the last 7 days.

About a month ago, County Commissioner John Wiley Price sent me a copy of a letter he had written to Assistant Attorney General William Bradford Reynolds. Commissioner Price requested a meeting with Mr. Reynolds to discuss complaints about the Dallas Police Department. His request was made prior to the shooting of Officer Chase and was not directly related to that tragic event.

Commissioner Price, as one of the leading elected officials in the black community, has every right to present his grievances to the Justice Department. Even though the city council has made real progress since the congressional hearing last year, Commissioner Price apparently feels stronger action is needed.

My personal preference at this point is for this matter to be handled on a local level in Dallas by our mayor and city council. I agree with the Reverend Jesse Jackson, Pettis Norman, and others that it's now time for Dallas to solve its own problems. I have no current plans to attend the meeting between Commissioner Price and Justice Department officials, but I will monitor the situation and make sure that Commissioner Price has every opportunity to have his views considered.

The Federal Government played an extremely important role last May by holding a congressional hearing in Dallas and focusing local attention on a problem that had long been ignored.

We should all support our police department, because they have a very difficult job to perform, and it is natural for our citizens to rally behind the police when an officer is killed in the line of duty.

We also should work to improve the department, for the benefit of the police officers, who deserve the best possible working conditions, and for all citizens of Dallas, who deserve the best possible police protection.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

### HON. WILLIAM F. CLINGER, JR.

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. CLINGER. Mr. Speaker, on February 2, 1988, I was absent from a vote on the Journal. Had I been present, I would have voted in

the following fashion: Rollcall No. 2, the House approved the Journal of Monday, February 1, "no."

#### UNSUNG HEROES

### HON. MIKE SYNAR

OF OKLAHOMA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SYNAR. Mr. Speaker, when Karl von Clausewitz wrote of the fog of war, he was describing the confusion and turmoil which bring uncertainty to the battlefield. But there is another fog in war, one that continues long after the final sounds of gunfire have receded, obscuring the complete record of the conflict.

On April 23, 1944, the 465th Bomb Group of the 15th Air Force took wing on the first leg of a mission over hostile territory. Leaving their base in sunny Italy, this flock of war birds headed north to their targets in Austria. The feelings of expectancy were high, lulled only by the steady drone of the B-24 engines.

Suddenly, the air filled with Nazi fighter aircraft; 200 gray metal demons leaped from the sky, spreading death and destruction in their wake. It was in this maelstrom of fire and iron that the plane commanded by James Gardner was shot out of formation.

The situation seemed hopeless. Descending at 60 mph over redline speed, the alarm bell was sounded from the cockpit for the evacuation of the crippled bomber. It was at this most furious moment that two men revealed the depth of human courage.

As engineer and crewchief, Frank Coupe and radio operator Cpl. Robert Field were preparing to abandon their stations on the waistguns and bail out, they noticed the ballgunner trapped in his turret. As their stricken aircraft plummeted toward the Earth below, these two men disregarded their own safety and rushed to the aid of their trapped comrade-in-arms. Because the hydraulic system had been damaged in its encounter with the German fighter, the two men had to crank open the ballturret manually. Then, they helped the ballgunner put on his parachute and followed him out the camera hatch.

Sadly, this tale of uncommon bravery does not have a happy ending. The parachute of Sgt. Frank Coupe failed to deploy, thus ending this heroic young man's life. The chute of Cpl. Robert Field barely opened in time, but left him, along with four other crew members, stranded behind enemy lines. These men soon joined the ranks of prisoners of war.

As for the fate of the bomber, four crew members remained on board and nursed the lumbering giant back to its Italian base. Once there, it was determined that the plane was too unsafe to land and the four airmen bailed out. These four men were awarded the Distinguished Flying Cross for their tremendous feat.

It was not until years later that the story of Sergeant Coupe and Corporal Field came to light at a recent reunion of their copilot William Boyd and the five crew members who were interned in a German prison camp. The two airmen had been overlooked, but not forgotten. Now the fog of war has lifted, and

these heroic men are at last getting the recognition they deserve.

#### TRIBUTE TO LARRY BIRD

### HON. CHESTER G. ATKINS

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. ATKINS. Mr. Speaker, tonight the most knowledgeable and loyal sports fans in America, the fans of the NBA Eastern Conference Champion Boston Celtics, honor the "Prince of Parquet," Larry Bird, at an unveiling of a life-sized wooden sculpture of Boston's premier starting forward.

While this statue, 7 feet and 275 pounds of laminated basswood, is a fitting monument to a great champion, it is still less real and less permanent than the memories Larry Bird has already left in the minds of Celtics fans.

A three-time all star, Larry Bird is, arguably, the most inspirational athlete in America. Possessed of tremendous individual abilities, his greatest talent is his selfless playing style. Larry Bird is the consummate teammate. He makes his team play better and harder.

We've all heard a lot recently about the "Massachusetts miracle"—well, as far as I'm concerned, tonight we honor him.

#### ASIAN AND PACIFIC ISLANDERS IN THE DECENNIAL CENSUS

### HON. MERVYN M. DYMALLY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. DYMALLY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to express my support of H.R. 3828, which requires certain detailed tabulations relating to Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders in the decennial census of population.

Under the current plans of the Bureau of the Census for the 1990 census, Asians and Pacific Islanders will be counted as a single category of individuals on the 100 percent and sample forms. The 100 percent form is sent to all households and the longer sample form is sent to a selected number of households. Both forms will provide space for respondents to write their ethnic subgroup.

In the 1980 census, Asians and Pacific Islanders were asked to indicate their ethnic background by selecting from a list of nine subcategories listed on the questionnaire. This information was tabulated by the Census Bureau to obtain relatively complete statistics on these subgroups.

The Census Bureau claims that certain operational problems were associated with the 1980 format which warranted the change to a write-in format. The write-in format requires the respondent to indicate in writing his/her ethnic background. The Census Bureau has decided, however, to tabulate the write-ins only from the sample forms which yield less detailed data.

By attempting to address the operational difficulties of the 1980 format, the Census



Bureau created a different problem. The writing and tabulation plans for 1990 would lead to less accurate and detailed information on Asian Americans and Pacific Islanders. Given the uses of census data by the Federal, State, and local governments, the insufficiency of information on Asians and Pacific Islanders becomes a critical issue.

Federal assistance to the elderly, State educational policies, and local government housing programs are only samples of social programs that rely on the accuracy of census data for their effectiveness. Inaccurate information undermines the needs of the Asians and Pacific Islanders when governments develop and administer their social services.

As chairman of the Subcommittee on Census and Population, the panel with oversight jurisdiction of the census, I fully understand yet another important reason for obtaining the most accurate possible count of our population. Without such accuracy, we would not be able to satisfactorily fulfill our constitutional responsibility of enumerating our population for purposes of fair representation in legislatures.

H.R. 3828 requires the Census Bureau to determine the best method for tabulating the population of Asian and Pacific Islanders subgroups. The only restriction is that the Census Bureau may not obtain such tabulation through the sample form.

I commend the author of this measure, Congressman ROBERT MATSUI, for his diligence in bringing this issue to the forefront. I am very pleased to have joined him in this effort. I urge my colleagues to consider supporting H.R. 3828.

### HOMETOWN HERO

#### HON. JOE SKEEN

OF NEW MEXICO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SKEEN. Mr. Speaker, just as Sunday's Super Bowl united the city of Washington in victory, the city of Hobbs, NM, also rejoiced in that victory because their hometown hero Timmy Smith played a part in it.

Today as we honor the world champions of football with a parade here in Washington, let me congratulate Redskin Timmy Smith from my home district—the city of Hobbs, NM. Timmy's education at Hobbs High School and his participation on "Eagle" athletic teams laid the ground work for what has become, in one short year, an impressive career for Timmy in the National Football League. In Sunday's Superbowl victory over the Denver Broncos Timmy gained more yardage than any other player, outdistancing the previous Superbowl record and scoring two impressive touchdowns to help the Redskins to one of the most lopsided Superbowl victories in history.

Congratulations Timmy, congratulations to your family and friends in Hobbs, NM, and congratulations to the people of Hobbs for all you did to encourage this young man to be the accomplished athlete he is today. I know Timmy will continue to set records in the NFL. While he sets a fine example for all our young athletes across the country.

### A WELL-DESERVED TRIBUTE TO HERBERT L. BELLAMY

#### HON. HENRY J. NOWAK

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. NOWAK. Mr. Speaker, this Thursday evening a testimonial dinner will be held in my hometown of Buffalo, NY, honoring one of the leaders of our city's black community, Herbert L. Bellamy.

This is a well-deserved honor for Herb, whose public and private sector achievements include service as an appointed and elected official, and recognition as a community activist and a successful businessman. He is truly a multifaceted person.

His career has included 9 years as councilman-at-large on Buffalo's Common Council, which followed a dozen years as a commissioner on the Buffalo Civil Service Commission, the first black to serve in that capacity.

A close friend of Herb's and one of the organizers of this week's testimonial is the Reverend Bennett W. Smith, Sr., pastor of St. John Baptist Church in Buffalo, another prominent leader in the city's black community.

In a recent article he prepared, Reverend Smith described Herb Bellamy as "a doer, an engine, a driving force \* \* \* a dedicated, determined and effective public servant."

Reverend Smith wrote:

One of 12 children of a North Carolina sharecropper, Herb Bellamy settled in Lackawanna, New York where he literally pedaled his way to success. He was a bicycle-borne liquor deliveryman in 1954. Eleven years later, he'd ridden his way to his own business, the first of 12 he'd found. In 1968, he opened Bellamy Liquors and when others were moving out of the East Side, Bellamy recalled his own struggles in poverty and stayed. His businesses created jobs in a community where hope was only a memory and opportunity was only as close as the next government check. Bellamy knew that jobs were the key to a stronger, prouder, thriving black community. He knew that you solved 90 percent of a man's problems by putting him to work and he put hundreds of people to work in various businesses he created.

Herb Bellamy was a dreamer. He dreamed of a better life. He dreamed of a better community. He dreamed of a better way to raise his family. But he was more. Herb Bellamy was prepared to pay the price to make his dreams realities. But still he wanted more. He wanted to make the dreams of others come true as well. Those dreams were the beginnings of 1490 Enterprises, Inc. Bellamy took a blighted inner city warehouse and turned an eyesore into the soul of an entire community. Today, that dilapidated building houses 32 local, state and federal government agencies. It feeds 150 senior citizens a day. It provides vital services to a community in need. It's a gathering point for neighborhood old folks where they pass the time together at cards, quilting or conversation. And it's an anchor, a monument to stability in a community of flux. North on Jefferson Avenue stands the neat Tudor housing complex that Herb Bellamy created back in 1980. More than 20 families live there. Just South in 1490 Manor, a Senior Citizens Home. It too is part of the Bellamy legacy \* \* \*.

Noting Mr. Bellamy's awards have included an honorary degree from Canisius College, the Buffalo News "Citizen of the Year" award, the Roberto Clemente Humanitarian Award, service awards from the United Negro Scholarship Foundation, the YMCA, the NAACP and the Urban League, Reverend Smith described him as "a leader of compassion, concern and commitment" and added:

That leader emerges every year to host the Black Achievers Dinner now heading toward its 16th year. It is the brainchild of Bellamy, designed to give recognition and community pride to those who have made contributions to the Black Community. The annual awardees provide significant insight into the purpose of the dinner. The celebrated and the sensational find seats next to unadorned and the ordinary. And both get recognized for their own particular contributions \* \* \*.

Mr. Speaker, Reverend Smith's comments eloquently paint the complex picture that depicts Herb Bellamy's many and diverse contributions to our community. I would simply like to add my congratulations to Herb on this occasion and wish him continued success.

### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

#### HON. BILL LOWERY

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. LOWERY of California. Mr. Speaker, because of a previous commitment I was unable to be in Washington yesterday, February 2, 1988. Had I been present, I would have voted in favor of H.R. 3884, to rescind the \$8 million appropriation for Jewish refugee schools in France.

While I appreciate the concern over the status of north African Jews in France that motivated this appropriation, this is not a project that should be funded by the U.S. Government. I support needed foreign aid programs such as refugee assistance. However, the construction of private schools in a developed nation like France is not a vital refugee program and raises other questions that should have prevented the original approval of this funding.

I support passage of H.R. 3884 to rescind this appropriation.

### U.N. HUMAN RIGHTS COMMISSION TO DISCUSS EAST TIMOR

#### HON. TONY P. HALL

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. HALL of Ohio. Mr. Speaker, this week the U.N. Human Rights Commission will be in session. During the course of its deliberations, it is expected that it will address the issue of human rights in East Timor.

A large number of my colleagues in both the House and the Senate have had a sustained interest in the plight of the people of East Timor, the former Portuguese colony which was invaded by Indonesia in 1975.

Most experts believe that a minimum of 100,000 Timorese perished as a result of the Indonesian invasion and subsequent occupation.

While some improvements for the people of East Timor have been noted in recent years, there is little doubt that serious problems persist and need to be addressed. Consistently disturbing reports from respected organizations like Amnesty International, the United States Catholic Conference, Asia Watch, and a variety of other credible sources underscore the need for action to end the suffering of the Timorese people and to bring a lasting peace to the island territory.

In the 99th Congress, 136 of my colleagues joined me as cosponsors of the resolution I introduced which called for a wide range of measures regarding East Timor. Given the ongoing international concerns about the well-being of the people of East Timor, I intend to renew this initiative in the near future.

At this time, the most immediate focal point for action to help the Timorese people is the U.N. Human Rights Commission meeting in Geneva. I urge all members of the U.N. Commission to adopt a resolution that will respond to the suffering of the people of East Timor. Human rights violations and grievances are a reality in East Timor, and the U.N. Human Rights Commission is an appropriate forum for their consideration.

Portugal, a nation with a long historical obligation to East Timor, now sits on the U.N. Commission. It is the hope of many in the U.S. Congress that Portugal will take advantage of its position to gather the Commission's support for measures that will lead to an improvement in human rights for the Timorese people.

The tragedy of East Timor will be compounded if the U.N. Human Rights Commission fails to endorse human rights for the Timorese people on this occasion.

Mr. Speaker, in order to update my colleagues on human rights conditions in East Timor, an article from the Boston Globe of December 13, 1987, follows:

[From the Boston Globe, Dec. 13, 1987]

A "HIDDEN HOLOCAUST" IN THE PACIFIC

(By Richard H. Stewart)

It has been called the "hidden holocaust," so far removed from the world's consciousness that only a handful of people are aware of the tragic events that have ravaged the population of the little-known Pacific island of East Timor.

It has been estimated that as many as 200,000 people out of a population of nearly 700,000 have perished from violence, starvation and disease since the 1975 invasion by troops of Indonesian dictator General Suharto.

Based on a population comparison, this would be comparable to 36 million deaths in the United States.

International human-rights organizations such as Amnesty International and Asia Watch as well as a coalition of international church groups have provided reports of the brutality inflicted on the Timorese by Indonesian forces, including summary executions, beatings, torture, imprisonment without trial and the use of civilians as human walls in front of Indonesian troops battling guerrilla forces.

Some civilians who have "disappeared" from their villages have been reported by

several independent sources to have been dropped to their deaths from helicopters. There have been reports of a photograph in an Indonesian newspaper showing Indonesian soldiers holding up the heads of their Timorese victims.

Exact death tolls can only be estimated because the Indonesians have virtually shut off the island to access by outsiders. But sources with contacts in East Timor insist the reports of inhuman treatment by the Indonesians are not exaggerated.

THE STAGGERING STATISTICS

The International Committee of the Red Cross has been able to provide food and medical aid to limited parts of the island and is the only humanitarian organization allowed access to the island, even on a restricted basis.

Some evidence of the human suffering can be surmised from the report in 1985 of East Timor Gov. Mario Carrascalao, who said that 100,000 East Timorese had died since 1975 and the island had 20,000 orphans, 13,000 widows and 8,000 crippled or maimed.

The 12-year agony of the Timorese began Dec. 7, 1975, when Indonesian troops invaded the island under the guise of preventing a communist takeover. They claimed that the East Timorese had sought integration with Indonesia.

According to Massachusetts Institute of Technology professor Noam Chomsky, President Gerald Ford and Secretary of State Henry Kissinger had advance knowledge of the invasion and authorized it. More than 90 percent of the invading troops carried American weapons, Chomsky has written.

In the aftermath of the invasion, the United States protested its illegality by announcing an embargo on the sending of American weapons to Indonesia. The embargo was nothing more than a political smoke-screen. Professor Benedict Anderson of Cornell University, an Asia expert, discovered from a Pentagon report that the flow of arms to Indonesia had never been halted.

Prior to 1975, East Timor had been under Portuguese rule for 400 years, but the Portuguese government had all but abandoned the island in the wake of domestic political problems at home, leaving it vulnerable to Indonesian expansionist interests.

Ten days before the invasion, the East Timorese declared themselves independent from Portugal under the rule of a political party known as The Revolutionary Front for the Independence of East Timor, which became better known as Fretilin.

To counter Indonesian forces, Fretilin leaders formed an armed guerrilla force, which has harassed the Indonesian military ever since.

Most recent estimates are that nearly two-thirds of the island, about the size of New Jersey, still has not been secured by Indonesian troops.

Last August, 40 US senators protested conditions in East Timor and wrote to Secretary of State George Shultz that Indonesian forces were engaged in "a renewed offensive" against Timorese insurgents. Similar protests have been lodged by 144 members of Congress.

A former apostolic administrator (the Catholic diocese is being administered from the Vatican rather than from Indonesia) from 1977 to 1983, Msgr. Martino da Costa Lopes, outlined the conditions of the population in a private letter last year:

"In the interior, in many villages and concentration camps, the people lack the condi-

tions of life to enable them to survive as a people . . . the people live in a state of permanent encirclement. They are not allowed to go more than three kilometers outside their villages. In addition, they always have to have a 'pass' issued by the Indonesian military authorities.

"It happens easily that East Timorese are accused of having contact with the guerrillas and then they become victims of torture, massacres, etc."

Msgr. Costa Lopes has testified that, when foreign visitors requested a meeting with him at his East Timor home, his home was first searched and Indonesian intelligence officers were often present during the discussions.

East Timor is predominantly Catholic. Indonesia is a Moslem nation.

CONDITIONS IN EAST TIMOR

Sources recently in contact with East Timor offer this picture of current conditions there:

A knock on the door is enough to make people afraid. Homes are raided and searched. People suspected of sympathizing with or supporting the guerrillas are arrested, often at night. People are afraid to be seen talking in groups.

It is illegal to listen to foreign broadcasts. People are arrested for having a radio. When foreign broadcasts do refer to East Timor, military vehicles tour the capital city of Dili with loudspeakers denouncing the broadcasts as lies.

Most jobs and places in schools go to Indonesians who have been moved into the island. Indonesian culture and language is being forced on the Timorese.

On the rare occasions when foreigners are allowed to visit, they are restricted in their movement. Indonesian soldiers are dressed in civilian clothes, and military vehicles are taken off the streets.

When foreign journalists visited the island during Indonesian elections in April, people were forced to take part in pro-Indonesian demonstrations. Even the prison population was released to swell the ranks of the demonstrators.

People who did not vote could not get identification cards, which are required for jobs and other means of survival.

Prisoners are held in secret prisons, which the Red Cross is not allowed to visit. Prisoners are beaten and tortured and some have been murdered.

Restrictions on movement make it difficult to grow crops, and severe malnutrition has resulted in some rural areas. Indonesia has taken control of the lucrative coffee crop.

Food shipped in from Indonesia is too expensive for many of the Timorese. There is a high mortality rate for children up to age 5.

Indonesia has instituted a highly-active birth-control program, particularly in the interior, where guerrillas are most active, using Depovera, a vaccine banned in most Western countries. The birth-control program is financed by the World Bank. Some men and women have been sterilized without their knowledge during medical treatment.

Medicines are so scarce that hospitals have a shortage. Medicines are also so expensive that much of the indigenous population can't afford them. Birth control is free.

The current apostolic administrator, Msgr. Carlos Zimenes Belos, is under close



military scrutiny. Military vehicles are frequently positioned outside his home.

Although the United Nations General Assembly condemned the Indonesian invasion soon after it occurred, 38 nations, including the United States, abstained. The resolution has been reaffirmed annually through 1982 but with dwindling support.

Indonesia's anticommunist government, its oil resources and strategic location between the Pacific and Indian oceans give it considerable international clout.

Portugal has neither the political will nor the military power to challenge the Indonesians, although there have been talks between the two nations.

A source in Lisbon said, "Indonesia feels it can keep protests at a lower level and avoid political embarrassment by agreeing to talks and making them drag on for as long as possible."

## NOBODY TAKES BLAME FOR EXPORT FINANCE ILLS

**HON. ROBERT GARCIA**

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. GARCIA. Mr. Speaker, last month, we were encouraged by a favorable turn in our trade deficit figures. During the month of November, our massive trade deficit declined by 25 percent, and U.S. exports increased by 9.4 percent. But the trade deficit still remains at an unsustainable level, and we, in Congress, must do all that we can to alleviate the problem.

Unfortunately, one major problem discouraging American exporters in trying to do their part to turn around our trade deficit has been the lack of export financing from the private sector. An article from *Journal of Commerce* of February 2, 1988 titled, "Nobody Takes Blame for Export Finance Woes" effectively describes the problem.

For your information, the Subcommittee on International Finance, Trade and Monetary Policy, which I chair, will be holding a hearing on February 25 on the financial condition of the U.S. Export-Import Bank as well as on the effectiveness of the new programs launched by the Bank in response to the 1986 Charter Renewal. Despite the budget constraints, Eximbank has made concerted efforts to compensate for the private bank's withdrawal from export financing. We will be looking into the ways in which Eximbank can further their efforts to ensure that the U.S. exporters have the competitive edge to sell their goods abroad.

I am submitting the *Journal of Commerce* article for my colleagues' perusal.

NOBODY TAKES BLAME FOR EXPORT FINANCE WOES

(By Mark Magnier)

"Two percent ten" is a phrase often used in the food export business to mean a 2% discount for bills paid within 10 days. But a joke going around the export community says two percent ten actually means a loan at 2% interest rate for 10 years.

The message behind the joke, says Ralph Chew—president of Chew International, a food and equipment export management company in New York—is that U.S. exporters are getting clobbered by the low-cost

loans their overseas competitors can offer potential customers. The loans often are secured by the competitors' governments.

"People say the U.S. is the center of world finance, yet we can't finance our exports," Mr. Chew said. "We don't have the terms (that overseas buyers) have grown accustomed to."

Cut-rate loans became popular in the early 1980s when a strong dollar limited U.S. sales overseas. Now, Mr. Chew said, even as the weaker dollar is reviving prospects for U.S. exports, the dearth of attractive U.S. financing is ruining deals.

Financing is often described as the spigot that controls the flow of exports. Exporters, bankers and government officials interviewed for this article all agree that U.S. export financing is in sad shape.

What they dispute, however, is who should take the blame and what should be done to improve the situation.

Exporters say the banks are gun-shy at a time when the weaker U.S. dollar has finally given U.S. products a competitive edge. Bankers admit they often hesitate to finance loans abroad but say they already are staggering from losses caused by previous loans, particularly to Latin America.

Bankers also say they can't be expected to give out cut-rate loans, particularly when the U.S. government has been slow to guarantee their deals. Government officials reply that banks should show more initiative.

William Easton, vice president and manager of the trade finance division of First Bank NA, based in Minneapolis, said banks also are discouraged from financing exports by changes in the Tax Reform Act of 1986.

The act curtailed foreign tax credits for export transactions while preserving those for import transactions. Bankers say this acts to encourage imports and discourage exports as the nation is fighting off a huge trade deficit.

"I can't quantify how many exports are lost specifically because of this (tax provision), but more will be lost this year than last year," Mr. Easton said.

Bankers in trade finance departments also say they receive little support or attention within the bank from their own top management.

Deregulation also matters. As banks have come under increasing competitive pressure they have divided their operations into separate profit centers. Trade finance is not currently a high-margin business.

Exporters and bankers say they must receive more help from the government in the form of loan guarantees.

"I say to a customer, if there's no government program backing us, don't even loosen your tie," says Philip Ferzan, senior vice president and general manager of First Fidelity Tradexport, a unit of First Fidelity Bank N.A. of Newark, N.J.

The major government program available to help finance exports is the Export-Import Bank, based in Washington. Ex-Im Bank has had its own problems recently trying to defend its losses—\$471 million in 1987—during a period of budget constraint.

Mr. Chew said this emphasis on making money is ill-conceived "When you're running a \$17.6 billion a month trade deficit, who's to say you're always supposed to make money," he asked.

In his view, the United States must make significant resources available if it is to take exporting seriously. He says it will take a "space-shuttle type program" with as much as \$8 billion in available financing to really get U.S. exports off the ground.

Jim Cruse, vice president of policy and planning for the Export-Import bank, says banks are partially to blame.

"Trade finance seems to be a dinosaur as far as most of the financial community is concerned," he said.

"The major issue for us is to see if the dinosaur will go extinct or if it will survive."

## BRIG. GEN. CLARA L. ADAMS-ENDER'S MESSAGE OF ENCOURAGEMENT

**HON. PETER W. RODINO, JR.**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. RODINO. Mr. Speaker, Brig. Gen. Clara L. Adams-ENDER recently shared her message of hope and encouragement with students in the 10th Congressional District. Addressing students at the 13th Avenue School and Malcolm X Shabazz High School in Newark and at Vernon L. Davey Junior High School in East Orange, the general urged these young people to work toward excellence and to begin setting goals for their lives.

Brigadier General Adams-ENDER speaks from experience. She initially enlisted in the Army as a means of obtaining a nursing education. But through hard work and dedication this talented individual quickly rose through the ranks. Twenty eight years later, she is the chief of the Army Nurse Corps, the highest ranking black women in the Army and 1 of only 4 females among the Armys' over 400 generals.

Brigadier General Adams-ENDER's accomplishments are a living testimony to her values of commitment and determination. Her example of individual motivation serves as an important role model for young people throughout the Nation.

I want to commend Brigadier General Adams-ENDER—not only for her accomplishments—but for sharing her enthusiasm and positive message with the students in my district.

Mr. Speaker, with your permission, I would like to include the following article in my remarks.

[From the Newark (NJ) Star-Ledger]

BLACK WOMAN GENERAL URGES STUDENTS IN ESSEX TO EXCEL

(By Stanley E. Terrell)

The highest-ranking black woman in the Army last week urged students in Newark and East Orange to work at achieving excellence and to begin setting goals for their lives.

In discussing her recipe for achieving success, Brig. Gen. Clara L. Adams-ENDER, chief of the Army Nurse Corps, also advised the youngsters not to overlook the armed forces when making career choices.

Adams-ENDER spoke to students at the Thirteenth Avenue School and Malcolm X Shabazz High School in Newark and at Vernon L. Davey Junior High School in East Orange during her visit to the area on Friday.

A native of North Carolina, Adams-ENDER said she was invited to Newark by her sister, Rosa Knight, a teacher at Shabazz. She also expressed interest in "talking to students

about doing whatever they want to do and learning to make those decisions. I also wanted them to know that the Army is a choice."

Her primary message was the need to "decide what you want to be in life and work hard for that goal. Never give up, and don't be afraid to ask for help from your parents and teachers."

One of only four females among the Army's 407 generals, Adams-Ender is responsible for 40,000 men and women in the Army's Nursing Corps around the world. She was chief of the nursing department at Walter Reed Army Hospital in Washington, D.C., from 1984 until earlier this year.

Enlisting in the military was a means of obtaining a bachelor's degree in nursing, with the Army picking up the tab for tuition, room and board.

"I walked by the recruiting desk, and I was told that they needed nurses badly. They said they would pay me \$250 a month, plus tuition, room and board. That was 28 years ago, and I'm still here," Adams-Ender said.

The general told the students to begin to appreciate the value of education and the necessity of developing a healthy mind and body, as well as the importance of starting to view the various choices, available in terms of career opportunities.

Adams-Ender said high school students must have vision, which she described as the ability "to be able to see the goal you want to accomplish and see that goal accomplished in your mind."

"Once you've made a decision and are able to see the goal accomplished in your mind, then you can put together the steps to get you to that point. It works. I'm a living witness. I didn't aspire to make general, but once I made colonel, I saw that I may indeed make general. And here I stand today, a general," Adams-Ender said.

She also stressed the importance of reading, noting that during summer breaks while she was attending college, she would read 60 to 80 books. "Reading exposes you to a lot of different worlds," the general said.

Adams-Ender said a question she frequently hears from students is how she could choose a career in the military "where somebody is always telling you what to do."

Recalling her days as a private, Adams-Ender recalled another private who decided "to count the ranks above him, to see how many people he had to take orders from." After he got the list, he was motivated to elevate himself, and last year he retired as a three-star general, she said.

While noting that persons enlisting have a long chain of command to whom they must answer, Adams-Ender said the pressures are no different from civilian jobs.

"Everybody has a boss—whether you're in the Army or not—to tell you what to do in the job force. You've got to think positive. Yes, there are folks who tell you what to do, but as you begin to move up the ladder and out of the lower ranks, then you get an opportunity to tell other folks what to do. The situation is indeed what you make it," the general said.

Adams-Ender said the military provided her with a number of educational opportunities, explaining that she has received two master's degrees while in the service and "managed to do a number of things that I wanted to do."

While acknowledging that it was difficult being a woman in the military services nearly three decades ago, Adams-Ender said the experience has been rewarding.

"It's tough to do it to start with if you're a woman, because there's that extra challenge. But once you make it, you make it. You'll never be a Pfc. again. One of the main things in the military was the opportunity to do a variety of jobs that I never would have otherwise had, being able to switch jobs without losing your position of seniority," she said.

High school students must learn the importance of study, nutrition and exercise and avoid the pitfalls of drugs and alcohol, the general said, adding that a necessary attribute for success must also be persistence.

"Persistence is the art of never giving up," she explained. "Even when it looks as if there's going to be something to stop you, sometimes maybe it's not the smartest thing to keep on pushing this day, but it's better to go to bed with the resolve that you will push again tomorrow."

"Just as I made it to this point, there's someone else out there who can do the same thing and more. There are opportunities available to you and you need to look into them and consider your choices," Adams-Ender said.

She also encouraged the students to "wake yourself up early in the morning" and begin focusing on achieving the excellence required to be successful.

"Figure out how to motivate yourself every day. Wake up and tell yourself you're okay, that what you are doing is important and that nobody else can do what you're doing but you," she said.

Asked about racial prejudice in the military, Adams-Ender said, "You must understand that the individuals who make up the military are extensions of the society. If you have prejudice here, you must know you will have it there."

"But we are a group that has to be able to work together and fight together, and since we're about defending the country, we have to be about resolving those problems. I think we have come much farther along than society at large in this area."

#### TRIBUTE TO DORCHESTER

##### HON. THOMAS J. RIDGE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. RIDGE. Mr. Speaker, today, I rise to pay tribute to the 45th anniversary of the sinking of the SS *Dorchester* and to the Chapel of Four Chaplains in Philadelphia. On that fateful day in 1943, four chaplains of different religious faiths paid the ultimate price for their country. A Nazi torpedo ripped apart the *Dorchester*, claiming all aboard the ship.

The Chapel of Four Chaplains was established as a living memorial to these fine men, Rev. George L. Fox, Rabbi Alexander D. Goode, Father Johnny P. Washington, and Rev. Clark V. Poling. The chapel provides interfaith vesper services every Sunday for church, veterans and civic groups, as well as for individuals. Besides other well-meaning and important community activities, the Chapel of Four Chaplains promotes and encourages interfaith and interracial unity, spiritual and community development, patriotism and citizenship. Emphasis is placed on the "spirit of sacrificial unselfishness with a vital faith and commitment to God and man as exemplified by the four chaplains."

Forty-five years ago, the Catholic, the Jew, and the Protestants faced death together on the slanting deck of the sinking ship and together they prayed. The lives of these four men has been an inspiration to me and to my faith and I am deeply honored today to add my words of praise to the four chaplains; Reverend Fox, Rabbi Goode, Father Washington, and Reverend Poling and to the Chapel of the Four Chaplains. May all look to them as an example of peace and cooperation.

#### PERSONAL EXPLANATION

##### HON. BOB CLEMENT

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. CLEMENT. Mr. Speaker, yesterday, I had the honor of meeting with President Reagan. Unfortunately, during the course of our meeting, two recorded votes occurred on the floor of the House.

Had I been present, I would have voted "yea" on passage of H.R. 3875, the Civil Service Due Process Amendments (Rollcall No. 3), and "yea" on passage of H.R. 3884, Rescinding Certain Budget Authority Recommended in Public Law 100-202 (Rollcall No. 4).

#### THE HEALTH COSTS OF AIR POLLUTION

##### HON. EDWARD J. MARKEY

OF MASSACHUSETTS

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. MARKEY. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take this opportunity to bring to my colleagues' attention a new study by the American Lung Association.

The Clean Air Act of 1970 was designed to be a cornerstone of efforts to reduce air pollution in order to protect public health and the environment. Unfortunately, the goals of the act have not been met. Not only have dozens of cities failed to meet existing standards, but there are major gaps in regulations needed to adequately reduce air pollution in this country. Specifically, the need for strong acid rain and air toxics legislation must be enacted by Congress this year.

The ALA publication, "The Health Cost of Air Pollution: A Survey of Studies Published 1978-1983," demonstrates how much air pollution has cost the United States in terms of health care costs, lost productivity and, most important of all, human lives. For instance, one of the studies summarized indicates that a 60 percent reduction in average 1978 particulate and sulfur dioxide emissions could save up to \$41 billion a year in health care costs.

As Congress debates changes in the Clean Air Act this session, I urge my colleagues to review this information and consider carefully the public health implications of air pollution.

#### CHAPTER I—THE HEALTH COSTS OF AIR POLLUTION, SUMMARY OF FINDINGS

The Clean Air Act of 1970 established as national policy the protection of public



health from the effects of air pollution and required that ambient air pollution standards be based on health considerations alone and without regard to the cost of compliance. The steadfastness of that policy statement over the years is a clear victory for environmental and health organizations and for citizens concerned about the quality of the air they breathe.

That victory is somewhat tarnished, however, by the slow pace with which air pollution standards have been developed since the Clean Air Act was passed for hazardous air pollutants suspected of causing severe health problems at low dosages. Standards for only six hazardous air pollutants have been adopted to date out of a priority list of 37 scheduled for possible regulatory action.

The failure of attempts to alter national policy separating economic considerations from decision-making with regard to the protection of public health from air pollution has not led to a lessening of interest in the economics of pollution and pollution control. Health cost information has entered into a wide range of environmental decision-making arenas, including those that set national or state pollution control priorities or strategies, and those in which the entire national environmental protection program has been reexamined in light of changing times and new information.

If the limited accuracy of health cost estimates published to date is understood and if the ethical implications and shortcomings in the methods of analysis used in such studies are respected, health cost information can be useful in many circumstances because it offers an important measure of part of the price tag of living in a polluted environment and an assessment of the economic benefits to be derived from pollution abatement programs. These are big if's, however, and they caution against the use of health cost studies as the basis upon which public health policies are established.

On the other hand, without health cost information, the only economic data available to decisionmakers tally the costs of pollution control programs, which, standing alone, can appear unreasonably high or low. Health cost information can help decisionmakers choose strategies capable of achieving public health protection goals quickly and cheaply and it can prod slowmoving environmental regulatory programs into higher gear.

#### THE FOUR STEPS IN CALCULATING HEALTH COSTS OF AIR POLLUTION

Health-cost studies generally follow a sequence of four steps:

1. Measuring the pollution
2. Counting the population at risk
3. Defining the dose-response function
4. Evaluating the health costs

The first step involves determining the levels of pollution to which people are exposed. The principal sources of this information are air pollution monitors run by state and federal agencies and private industry. Since passage of the Clean Air Act the number of air pollution monitors has increased to over 5,000 nationwide, and information is now being collected for more pollutants than in the past. However, those data are not always reliable and, even if reliable data were uniformly available, readings from the few monitors that exist relative to the number of people exposed to air pollution offer poor measures of the actual amount of pollution that the public is exposed to. Moreover, most health cost studies continue to be confined, because of limited resources or the constraints placed by the

method of investigation, to an analysis of exposure to one or, at most, just a few air pollutants. This approach ignores the potential for combinations of air pollutants to multiply their individual health effects.

The second step in health cost studies involves determining the population at risk of health damage from air pollution. The most commonly used technique simply refers to census data to determine the number of people living within an area selected for analysis. The heterogeneity of the population in different regions of the country, outdated census data, and shifts in the composition of a population during a study period are among the problems that hamper precise identification during health cost studies of the population at risk. Despite these problems, studies are gradually becoming more sophisticated in their ability to define populations actually exposed to the air pollution identified during step one—often by focusing on populations living near pollution monitors and or by compensating for factors, such as the migration of people into and out of communities, that could bias the results of health-cost studies.

The third step in health cost studies is establishing a dose-response function that defines the expected degree of adverse health impact, including deaths, which results from exposure to a given level of air pollution. Most scientists performing health cost investigations rely on epidemiological studies of large numbers of people living in many regions of the country under a wide range of conditions to establish dose-response relationships. Other approaches involve laboratory tests of the reactions of animals to doses of pollution, clinical studies of individual physiological responses to pollution under controlled environmental conditions, and investigations involving a small group of people living and working under various levels of pollution exposure.

There are several types of epidemiological studies. Cross-sectional studies analyze the relationship between pollution and public health in different regions of the country—for example, in a number of cities or urban counties—during a specified time period. Time-series studies examine the relationship between public health and levels of pollution at different times in a single region. In addition, epidemiological studies can investigate the relationship between pollution and death rates (mortality studies) or they can examine the effects of pollution on injury and sickness rates (morbidity studies). Epidemiological studies generally use regression analysis, a statistical tool, to examine individual factors, including pollution, that may affect human health. The goal of regression analysis in health studies is to establish and quantify associations between such factors and the status of public health.

Since 1978 many dose-response studies have been published. Although some studies fail to detect a link between exposure to air pollution and adverse health effects, most recent studies add to the body of evidence suggesting that air pollution can and does sicken people and lead to premature death. Nevertheless, there is considerable divergence among the findings of different dose-response studies with regard to which pollutants are the main culprits responsible for those adverse health effects and what concentrations of pollutants are needed to cause adverse health effects.

Some other important findings and trends in recent dose-response studies include the following:

The preponderance of evidence continues to suggest that exposure to air pollution in concentrations frequently found in urban areas causes illness and premature death.

Several studies reviewed suggest that air pollution plays a smaller role than indicated by older studies, although its role is still significant.

Most dose-response studies are limited to the examination of a few air pollutants. To the extent that health effects of different pollutants are additive, the actual health effects of all pollutants to which people are exposed, including effects that stem from the interaction of pollutants, could be much higher than those suggested by the limited studies.

Many more health effects, including death and sickness, have been found to result from exposure to particulates, sulfur dioxide, and sulfates which are emitted largely by stationary sources than from exposure to those pollutants emitted mainly by automobiles—nitrogen dioxide, carbon monoxide, and photochemical oxidants.

Many studies find little evidence to support the threshold concept, which proposes a non-linear relationship between air pollution exposure and health effects. The threshold concept assumes that there is a level of air pollution that is safe to breathe and that adverse effects occur only when those concentrations are exceeded. Many dose-response studies suggest that adverse health effects result from exposure even to very low pollution levels, although those effects are much less significant than those that occur at higher concentration.

In the fourth and final step in health cost studies, a monetary value is placed on each health response to air pollution exposure, including premature death. This step involves many subjective and often troubling assumptions about the statistical value of human health and life itself. As with dose-response studies, a considerable amount of work related to value-of-life evaluation was done between 1978 and 1983.

The most significant development has been an almost complete switch in recent years in the method used by economists to assign monetary values to human life and health. Before 1978 most studies used the human-capital approach, which evaluates the economic cost to a person of illness and death in terms of the wages he or she would lose from a pollution-caused illness or premature death from exposure to air pollution compared with wages expected from an otherwise normal life. Since 1978 most studies have used economic valuations developed through an alternate approach called "willingness to pay." Willingness-to-pay studies usually attempt either to define how much money people actually pay in their daily lives or that they purport to be willing to pay to enjoy a reduction in the risk that they will die prematurely or contract an illness or they attempt to quantify the amount of money required to convince people to accept an incrementally higher risk to their health or life.

The following conclusions with regard to recent research studies that assign economic values to life and health are identified:

Willingness-to-pay studies used an array of techniques to collect the data on which their conclusions are based. Some of the techniques include examining wage premiums paid to workers in high-risk jobs, the willingness of people to spend a few seconds of their time buckling seat belts, and preferences for crosswalks in favor of more risky jaywalking. Surveys have attempted to de-

termine how much people would pay for improved medical care and for safer air travel. The information collected by each of those techniques can be used to calculate, by extrapolation, a value of a statistical life.

Willingness-to-pay studies report a wide range of human-life values, from \$300,000 to more than \$5 million, but the results of many studies are in the vicinity of \$1 million. Nearly all willingness-to-pay studies place a value on human life several times higher than the values assigned by using the human-capital approach.

Several troublesome aspects of the human-capital approach that result from its reliance on the wage-earning power of a person as the basis of evaluating human worth are avoided by the willingness-to-pay approach.

The willingness-to-pay approach faces very difficult obstacles as it attempts to assess what people's true preferences and willingness to pay are. Surveys, for example, may contain spurious responses. Also, willingness-to-pay can be affected by how much a person believes he or she can afford to pay and by his or her perception of risk, rather than by the true risk he or she faces. Another aspect of this approach is that it, like the human-capital method, results in a measurement of the value of a statistical life saved, which is a concept quite different from the actual death of a human being.

#### COMPREHENSIVE HEALTH COST SURVEYS

Comprehensive health cost studies are those investigations that incorporate all four steps outlined above and that assign some economic cost to a specified population associated with adverse health effects stemming from exposure to air pollution. This report reviews eight such studies published between 1978 and 1983. Those studies are divided into three groups. Four research projects studied national health costs from air pollution, three for the U.S. and one for 11 western European countries. Two studies investigated the health costs from air pollution within particular regions of the U.S. The final two studies identified the health costs associated with particular small increments of air pollution concentrations without assessing the total health costs either nationally or regionally. Several studies examined only the effects of pollution on death rates; others examined only the effects on sickness rates; a few studies looked at both.

A generalization drawn from the results of the studies reviewed in this survey is that total health costs in the United States from exposure to the key air pollutants now regulated by the Clean Air Act are more likely to fall in the range of the low tens of billions of dollars and less likely to fall in the billions-of-dollars or hundreds-of-billions-of-dollars range. The studies reviewed place a national health cost bill from exposure to the two or three most widely investigated pollutants between about \$5 billion and \$40 billion.

Those findings are similar to the observations made in the 1978 American Lung Association publication, which reviewed earlier health cost research, although the range of findings was found to be not as broad at that time. The similarity is to some degree coincidental, because different methods used in more recent reports often led to calculations during the four intermediate steps widely divergent from the results of earlier studies. When the four steps were combined, however, many of the differences canceled each other out. For example, some recent studies have identified fewer health

effects from pollution exposure compared with the findings of earlier projects, but they assign a higher cost to each health problem.

Recent studies continue to be limited in scope to investigating just a few of the many pollutants that may cause health-related economic costs. Of the few pollutants studied with any degree of depth, particulates, sulfur dioxide, and sulfates appear to cause more adverse health effects, including deaths, than carbon monoxide, photochemical oxidants, and nitrogen dioxide.

Some key findings of each of the eight studies reviewed in this survey appears below. A summary chart at the end of this chapter contains additional information about the studies. The findings presented here are those of the authors of the studies reviewed and are not conclusions of the American Lung Association.

A 60% reduction in average 1978 particulate and sulfur dioxide emissions in the United States would save between \$5.1 billion and \$15.9 billion in annual health costs related to premature deaths. Reduced sickness or morbidity costs would be worth about \$25 billion a year (Crocker, et al. 1979).

The 20% reduction in average particulate and sulfur dioxide air pollution in the U.S. between 1970 and 1978 saves about \$13.9 billion a year in mortality-related costs and about \$2 billion a year in morbidity costs (Freeman, 1982).

Reductions in particulate and sulfate air pollution achieved between 1970 and 1978 solely because of pollution control requirements set by the Clean Air Act save about \$4.4 billion a year in mortality-related health costs (NERA, 1980).

Implementation of a program designed to reduce sulfur dioxide emissions in 11 European countries to levels 34% of those in 1974 would increase the average life expectancies of individual national populations by as much as 562 days. Health cost savings related to reduced morbidity alone would be reduced by \$5.8 billion a year through this program (OECD, 1981).

A program to reduce particulate and sulfur dioxide emissions at two power plants in the Tampa Bay region of Florida would produce morbidity health cost benefits of \$5.1 million a year compared with an annual cost of the program of \$3.1 million. If the pollution abatement program were extended to a third power plant in the region, however, total morbidity cost benefits of \$5.4 million a year would fall below the annual cost of the program, estimated at \$9.3 million (Loehman, et al. 1979).

Programs to reduce 1977 average particulate and sulfate air pollution in six urban California regions would save 850 people each year from premature deaths resulting from exposure to air pollution. Mortality health cost benefits from those programs would be \$400 million a year (PIE-West, 1979).

Reducing the average nationwide concentration of sulfur dioxide by one microgram per cubic meter would result in a reduction in morbidity health costs of \$20 million a year (Fishelson and Graves, 1978).

Reducing the average nationwide concentration of particulate or sulfur dioxide air pollution by one microgram per cubic meter would produce mortality health cost benefits worth between \$10 and \$25 per person per year. A similar reduction in sulfate pollution would benefit each American between \$75 and \$150 per year (Halvorsen and Ruby, 1981).

#### WHERE TO GO WITH WHAT IS KNOWN

More is now known about the relationship between air pollution, health effects, and economics than at any previous time. That adverse health effects exist is firmly established. But even the most recent and comprehensive health effects assessments are still unable to pinpoint with precision specific health effects associated with the exposure of people to concentrations of individual pollutants, not necessarily because effects don't exist, but because of difficulties in measuring them. Health cost studies which merge health-effects research with equally imprecise value-of-life assessments suffer from a compounding of uncertainties and they are even less accurate.

The research performed during the preparation of this book suggests that continued, cautious use of health cost information can assist environmental policy decisionmakers. However, the quality and usefulness of health cost information could be improved if greater effort were expended collecting and analyzing the data needed to perform health cost studies and if additional attention were devoted to resolving the difficult ethical and social issues that are raised by health cost investigations.

#### NATIONAL SCHOOL COUNSELING WEEK

HON. DALE E. KILDEE

OF MICHIGAN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. KILDEE. Mr. Speaker, I rise today to ask that my colleagues join me in acknowledgment of the ninth annual National School Counseling Week which is February 1 through 5. The school counselor is an integral member of America's education team, and is the linchpin in helping our Nation's young people solve many educational, social, and family problems with which they are confronted.

Today's school counselor is a trained professional who can effectively work with students. School counselors are oftentimes at the frontline of crisis situations, and are the gatekeepers to the other helping professions. As a former educator, I witnessed firsthand the dedication which school counselors have to their students. In addition to ensuring that a student succeed in their education endeavors, today's school counselor must be able to address problems which include: teen pregnancy, substance abuse, and youth suicide. I, for one, am glad to rise in support of school counselors and to congratulate them on the role they play in working with our country's most valuable resource.

I would also like to acknowledge the work of the American School Counselor Association, a division of the American Association for Counseling and Development. ASCA is the largest body of its type in the world and seeks to support the school counseling profession by issuing a code of ethics, producing journals, and conducting professional development sessions to constantly improve the skills of its members.

As a Member of Congress, I value the contribution of school counselors in helping to build America. As a father, I value high quality school counselors in helping my children



reach their full human potential. Mr. Speaker, I ask my colleagues to join me in congratulating ASCA and all school counselors during National School Counseling Week.

## HEALTH-RELATED OUTCOMES OF WAR IN NICARAGUA

### HON. PAT WILLIAMS

OF MONTANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. WILLIAMS. Mr. Speaker, I submit the following study of some of the effects of the war in Nicaragua.

#### HEALTH-RELATED OUTCOMES OF WAR IN NICARAGUA

(By Richard M. Garfield, RN, MPH, DrPH; Thomas Frieden, MD, MPH; and Sten H. Vermund, MD, MSc)

##### INTRODUCTION

While dramatic health improvements in Nicaragua and other Central American countries have been reported in recent years, warfare throughout the region has been detrimental to the population's well-being. Rising rates of malaria, measles, and polio have been reported, and warfare has become the most commonly reported cause of death in some Central American countries. The present report quantifies the health effects of warfare during the last four years in one Central American country, Nicaragua.

##### MORBIDITY/MORTALITY RATES

By May 1, 1986, a total of 4,429 war-related deaths had been reported in Nicaragua (Figure 1). Casualty figures from Nicaraguan sources have been interpreted variously. The term "casualty" in the Nicaraguan context usually includes the total of dead, wounded, and kidnapped persons. Figures for the number of dead have sometimes included the estimated number of contra dead. Such data are of uncertain reliability and not all of the contra dead are Nicaraguan. The figures reported here include only those fatalities among civilian and military personnel on the Nicaraguan side of the conflict.

The dead include at least 210 persons under 12 years of age, 274 high school or college students, and 76 technicians or professionals. Nearly a third of all deaths occurred among civilians. This high civilian fatality rate is apparently a result of strategic considerations on the part of attacking "contra" troops. Targeting of civilians at farm cooperatives, on isolated roads, or in rural health centers appear designed to destabilize the Sandinista regime rather than to engage troops in battle. Data on the number of fatalities are derived from body counts and therefore may be considered minimum estimates.

An estimated .04 per cent of the country's 3.3 million population has been killed in fighting since 1982. From 20 per cent to 30 per cent of all accidental or violent deaths registered in Nicaragua since 1983 are related to the war (Ministry of Health unpublished). In the regions suffering the greatest number of casualties, 7 percent of all registered deaths were war-related in 1985, making this the third most common cause of death.

The war-related fatality rate among the general Nicaraguan population is more than 10 times greater than the aggregate rate of

.003 per cent experienced by the United States population during the Vietnam War between 1965 and 1973. It is also greater than the aggregate rate of .03 percent experienced by the U.S. population during World War II. Still, the total number of fatalities among Nicaraguans amounts to only about 10 per cent of the number killed in that country's revolutionary war of 1978-79. It is estimated that 35,000-50,000 person died in the Nicaraguan revolutionary war.

Some 4900 war-related injuries and 3800 kidnappings have been reported among Nicaraguan military and civilians from 1983 to 1985 (Figure 1). In four major wars of the twentieth century, a minority of all casualties became fatalities. In contrast, among Nicaraguan casualties since 1982, close to half were fatalities. This appears to result from the particular nature of the contra attacks: mining of rural roads, mortar attacks on isolated villages, and ambushing of vehicles. By the end of 1985, over 100 rural communities had been attacked, 345 civilian vehicles had been ambushed, and 51 assassinations of local leaders had been reported. Among survivors, the predominant wound site is the lower extremities as a result of fragmentation and explosion caused by mines or mortars. Contra officials appear to have made a strategic decision to expand such attacks with materials supplied through new U.S. Congressional appropriations.

##### ATTACKS ON HEALTH WORKERS

Contra military strategies have resulted in a higher number of casualties among health personnel. By December 1985, 42 salaried health workers were reported to have been killed by the contras; 31 others have been kidnapped, and 11 more were reported to have been wounded (Figure 2). Some of the medical victims, such as Dr. Gustavo Sequiera, Vice Dean of the Managua Medical School, and Dr. Myrna Cunningham, Governor of Northern Yeliza province, are well known members of the Nicaraguan medical establishment. Most victims, however, are young health professionals who work in isolated rural communities. Some were killed when they happened to be in an area under attack; others were specifically identified as targets in order to disrupt health services. Such attacks are not limited to Nicaraguan nationals; in 1983, a French physician and a West German physician were killed in a mortar and rifle attack, respectively. During 1986, a Swiss technician and a Spanish nurse died in separate contra ambushes on jeeps. At least one U.S. physician survived a contra rocket attack against the commercial ferry upon which she was traveling (A. Lifflander, personal communication); no British or North American health workers have yet been killed.

##### EFFECTS ON SOCIAL SERVICES

Contra actions have led to the destruction of 300 work centers, destruction of 58 schools and the closing of 502 more, and the destruction of 2,100 homes and 11 social welfare centers as of early 1986. This has reportedly affected 7 per cent of elementary students and 6 per cent of adult education students. Sixty-five health facilities, including four large clinics and one hospital, are reported to have been completely or partially destroyed. In addition, 37 health units located in war zones have been abandoned by the government. The loss in available facilities has coincided with an increased need for medical and social services. The war has created a large group of disabled young adults needing rehabilitative care and equip-

ment. About 9,000 orphans have resulted from deaths to adults.

Some closed or damaged social service institutions have reopened when greater stability returned to the zones in question. Of the 226 schools which were closed in 1984 or 1985, 176 are reported to have reopened during 1986. Several medical clinics have been destroyed and rebuilt as many as three times in the past four years. The Nicaraguan government estimates that close to 10 per cent of the country's inhabitants have lost access to health services because of the war.

The Nicaraguan Ministry of Health estimates that a total of \$25 million in damage to the health system has been sustained. About half of this damage has been to physical plants, while the rest involves destroyed or stolen equipment and supplies. The economic value of destruction to the health system is only a small part of the estimated \$2 billion worth of losses sustained by the country as a result of the war.

Contra attacks, lack of supplies, and war-related economic instability have forced about 250,000 Nicaraguans from their homes. About half of the displaced have resettled in some 80 new communities established by the government in areas near their original homes. Most of the other displaced persons have fled to major cities. This migration is a severe strain on the social and health infrastructure of the country. A health clinic is usually established within several months of the identification of relocation settlements, but water, sanitation, and food production systems may take a year or more to establish. Setting up these emergency services is a severe drain on the country's economy, since defense and reconstruction consume most of the national budget.

##### INFECTIOUS DISEASES

National malaria control efforts are considered quite successful in the eight provinces of the country which suffer few direct attacks by the contras. In these areas, the number of malaria cases recorded from January 1983 to April 1985 was 62 per cent lower than the monthly average during the previous eight years. During this same period, the number of malaria cases detected in the war zones was 17 per cent greater than the monthly average during the previous eight years. War-related population movements, the inability to carry out timely disease control activities, and shortages of health personnel in the war zones are likely responsible for the inability to reduce malaria transmission in these areas. Relatively greater underreporting of malaria cases in areas of conflict underestimates the differences in malaria incidence in the war and non-war zones. An investigation of positive cases in three of the eight non-war provinces during the first six months of 1984 showed that 78 per cent of all slide-verified cases were imported from the war zones. The areas most disrupted by the war, Regions 2 and 6, had reported 35 per cent of all malaria cases in 1983. In the first 11 months of 1986, 76 per cent of all reported malaria cases came from these areas. The risk of contracting and reporting a case of malaria from these areas was 7.6 times greater than in the rest of the country. War-related population movements, crowding among the displaced, and lack of resources in the preventive health services are also associated with increases in dengue and leishmaniasis.

A measles epidemic in 1985-86 appears to be intimately related to the war. Coverage

of children under five years of age with measles vaccine had risen above 50 per cent for the first time in Nicaragua in 1982. Successive community health campaigns and immunizations provided through the primary health system further raised coverage in ensuing years. This was associated with the reporting of 200 to 75 cases per year in a declining trend during 1981-84. With the growth of the war in 1983, coverage with measles vaccine declined in war zone Regions 1 and 6. More importantly, many isolated rural communities went wholly unvaccinated because of the dangers posed by the war for health volunteers and medical professionals. This lack of coverage continued through 1985, creating a large pool of susceptibles under five years of age. By July of 1985, an epidemic was noted in Region 6. Of the 953 measles cases reported in the entire country in 1985, 49 percent came from Region 6 during the last six months of the year. By February 1986, the epidemic had spread to Region 1. During the first nine months of 1986, Regions 1 and 6 registered 51 per cent of the 2,021 measles cases reported in Nicaragua. Expanded immunization efforts in 1986 led to 60 per cent coverage of children under one year of age in these regions. This seems only to have attenuated the epidemic; the most vulnerable communities are still too dangerous for health workers to enter.

Other less contagious vaccine-preventable diseases which are targets of major control efforts have not rebounded. No cases of polio have been reported since 1981. Promotion of maternal immunization since 1983 has brought a gradual reduction in the number of reported cases of neonatal tetanus, from 132 in 1981 to 76 in 1985 (Ministry of Health, unpublished data). The decline in neonatal tetanus cases, however, would likely have been greater if the war had not disrupted efforts to train and supply rural midwives.

#### HEALTH INFRASTRUCTURE

Despite attacks on the health system and its personnel, a part of the country's health infrastructure has continued to grow in recent years. The number of doses of measles and polio vaccine administered increased slightly in 1985, reaching approximately 188,000 and 2,189,000 doses respectively. This followed a more rapid rise in the number of doses administered during 1980-83. The number of vaccine doses provided in preventive health campaigns, which grew rapidly during the 1980s, has continued to rise rapidly during the past three years. In 1985, health campaigns provided 45 per cent and 75 per cent of all doses administered of measles and polio vaccines, respectively.

The number of children under five years of age seen in oral rehydration centers rose 17 per cent during 1983-85, to reach a total of 173,000 visits in 1985. During the same period, the number of prescriptions filled rose by 19 per cent, reaching a total of more than 15 million in 1985.

The capacity of the public curative medical system expanded rapidly during 1980-83. In 1983, over 6.3 million medical visits and 207,000 hospitalizations were reported. The number of medical visits recorded in the national health system fell 9 per cent and the number of hospitalizations fell 10 per cent from 1983-84. Estimated coverage in the program of supplemental feedings to malnourished children fell from 38 per cent in 1983 to 28 per cent in 1985. Coverage in the program for postpartum care for low weight births fell from 52 per cent to 33 per cent in 1985. These decreases appear to result pri-

marily from the closing of health centers and the mobilization of civilian health workers to the armed forces. A total of 5,186 health workers have served for periods varying from 2 to 12 months in the militia. The number of doctors and nurses employed by the public health system fell by 10 per cent and 8 per cent, respectively, during 1983-86. There were 1,959 physicians and 1,167 professional nurses employed by the national health system in June 1986. During this same period, the number of surgical interventions rose by 4 per cent to reach more than 56,000 in 1986, reflecting improved utilization of existing capacity.

From 1983 to 1985, the number of visits to a physician dropped from 2.0 to 1.7 per capita; this decline followed a rapid rise from 0.8 annual visits per capita prior to 1979. Between 1983 and 1985, the number of medical visits among children under one year old fell from 3.8 to 2.4, while among one to four year olds, it had dropped from 1.6 to 1.0 per capita. The site at which ambulatory care is provided is also changing. While outpatient visits to hospitals fell from 4.1 million in 1983 to 3.4 million in 1985, visits to hospital emergency rooms doubled, reaching 55,000 in 1985.

It was planned to extend coverage to an average of 2.0 visits to a doctor per capita in 1986 (Ministry of Health, unpublished). This rise was to be brought about through increased employment of physicians in decentralized ambulatory care settings. In this way, increased medical contact would reduce pressure on hospitals to provide episodic ambulatory care.

Estimated infant mortality levels have remained stable since 1983 at 76 per 1,000 live births (Latin American Demographic Center [CELADE], unpublished). This followed rapid improvements in Nicaragua's mortality profile from 1979-83. A survey of 10,000 households using indirect demographic methods in 1986 found a more rapid decline in infant mortality in outlying regions than was expected. There is evidence, however, of a rise in infant mortality rates in the region which includes the capital city during the last two years. This rise may be the result of a rapid influx of persons displaced from the war zones. While war-related disruptions appear to have slowed or halted improvements in the country's health situation, deterioration in the population's overall health status has not been noted. The Ministry of Health's primary short-term goal is to maintain the improvements in the population's health status which occurred in the early 1980s (D.M. Tellez, Minister of Health, personal communication).

#### HUMAN RIGHTS DURING ARMED CONFLICT

In military parlance, the war in Nicaragua is a "low intensity conflict." While it may be low in intensity for the organizers and financial backers of the contra forces, it appears to be high in intensity for the target population. The particular epidemiologic profile of Nicaragua has been affected by three war-related phenomena: a rising death rate due to military engagements; uncontrolled human migration in the war zones; and the establishment of new communities by those displaced by the war. Low intensity warfare often targets the civilian population for hostilities. Doctors, nurses, and patients are frequently victims. This violates customary and salutary international law regarding the neutrality of health workers in situations of war. Such warfare has inhibited both the general population's efforts in seeking health services, as well as well as

the ability of health workers and volunteers to provide services to those in need.

## THE DEPRESSION REVISITED

### HON. NEWT GINGRICH

OF GEORGIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. GINGRICH. Mr. Speaker, the recent stock market fall in October has sparked a debate over the causes of the 1929 stock market crash and the Depression of the 1930's. One of America's most prominent magazines, *American Heritage*, conducted an interview with economist Jude Wanniski on the similarities of the 1929 and 1987 crashes. Those interested in learning the lessons of history should read Wanniski's brilliant analysis of this issue.

[From *American Heritage*, February 1988]

CAN HISTORY SAVE US FROM A DEPRESSION?

An interview with Jude Wanniski

(By Timothy C. Forbes)

Jude Wanniski was among the early leaders in the revival of supply-side economic theory. A former associate editor of *The Wall Street Journal*, he founded and is president of the consulting firm *Polyconomics, Inc.*, which is located in Morristown, New Jersey, and advises leading corporations and institutional investors on economics, politics, and communications. In 1978 Simon & Schuster published his pioneering book on economic theory and history, *The Way the World Works*. In it he draws heavily on historical precedent to argue that low tax rates are essential not merely to the wealth of a nation but to the welfare of its citizens and the progress of society. His ideas have significantly influenced the Reagan administration. Interestingly, he has no formal training in economics (he holds a B.A. in political science and an M.S. in journalism from UCLA); but the late chairman of the Federal Reserve, Arthur Burns, once observed to him that this was precisely his advantage. In addition to his work as a consultant and economist, Wanniski edits *The Media Guide*, an annual survey and review of the media that is wide-ranging in its coverage and outspoken in its evaluations.

This conversation took place in Wanniski's office on Election Day, November 3, 1987.

*In your book *The Way the World Works*, you pin the cause of the crash of October 1929 on the rising protectionist sentiment that ultimately yielded the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act. That's not the consensus of economic historians. How did you come to this idea?*

Until October 1987, at least, the crash of 1929 was the most cataclysmic economic event of the century. As a result of the crash of '29, supply-side economic theory, which had been dominant in the Western world for almost two centuries, was forced into retreat. In other words, those economists who build their ideas, their economic models around the assumption that the producer of goods was the dominant actor in the economy couldn't explain why the market crashed. Consequently, policy makers turned to alternative models. They turned to demand-side economists, the Keynesians and the monetarists, who came



up with the idea that the Depression had occurred because of insufficient purchasing power. The masses of people had insufficient purchasing power, insufficient demand power. So the demand-management school of economics took over, and bit by bit became dominant throughout Europe and especially in the United States. But by the 1970s the demand-side theories were no longer working. They could not explain the stagflation that began creeping into the system in the late sixties and became a way of life in the 1970s.

This was the state of things that led me to those economists who were reviving classical theory—supply-side theory—as a way of thinking about the world of the 1970s. But the requirement, I felt, was to find a rationale for the cause of the crash of '29 that would enable us to rehabilitate the classical model. I knew there had to be some event that caused such a cataclysmic interruption in dealings between producers and traders. And my answer was that it was the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930.

*How did you make this discovery?*

I was at the American Enterprise Institute for Public Policy Research writing my book, and I had promised the publishers that I would explain the crash. But I was already into the fourth chapter, and I was no closer to finding the causes. Then one of the professors at the institute, Dr. Gottfried Haberler, and I had lunch. And I could see that there was nothing I could squeeze out of him that I hadn't gotten out of the literature. But when I got back to my office, a messenger came from his office with a monograph he had written on the Great Depression. It was only thirty pages long, and, maybe on page 12, Haberler had mentioned something about how the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act of 1930 had contributed to the Great Depression. When I saw "1930," I got very excited, because I'd always thought Smoot-Hawley was 1931. But 1930 meant that the Congress that passed Smoot-Hawley was the same one that was sitting in 1929. Well, I couldn't wait to get into the library to get out the The New York Times microfilm and crank it to the last week in October.

There, at the top of the page, the market was crashing—and on the bottom of the page, the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act was being debated in the United States Congress. So that was the "Aha!" experience.

*In John Kenneth Galbraith's book The Great Crash, 1929, he proposes quite a different hypothesis, one that I think appeals to the moralist bent in Americans. He acknowledges that tax rates, monetary policy, and earnings expectations motivate stock prices early in a bull market. But as the prices rise for a period of time, a new element enters. He calls it the "dynamics of speculation"—greed, in short. This dynamic drives the price out of any relation to underlying values. In fact, a crash—the crash of '29, and I'm sure he'd think much the same about the crash of '87—is inherent in this very dynamic. It's inevitable that the bubble is going to burst once this virus has infected the system. How credible an explanation of the rise and fall of bull markets do you believe this is?*

In the largest sense I don't think it has very much substance. There's certainly truth to the idea that most people who are piling into a bull market don't really know what they're doing. They're being pulled in by the vacuum. What's really happening is an arbitrage between profit opportunities and the availability of capital. And it's

almost a mathematical certainty that if profit opportunities are seen by people, and they are willing to commit enough of their resources, they draw others in.

But what you have with a sharp run-up in the value of shares in the 1920s and 1980s is a reaction to long periods before then of errors in economic policy that drove profit opportunities down to a very low level. And suddenly some smart people came in and changed the structure of Government policy. Profit opportunities rose so quickly that markets adjusted rapidly. Then the collapse in prices occurred because a great, almost accidental error was made; in the case of Herbert Hoover it was his signing of protectionist trade legislation.

There's this idea that much of the run-up occurs because of the greater fool thesis, that people are buying shares and passing them on, one to the other. But this ignores, especially in the United States, the tremendous hedge markets we have. We've got a lot of smart people out there who are selling short, betting the market will fall. And they're as motivated by greed in their short sales as others who are motivated by greed going long.

I've always felt that Galbraith, if he had looked at the New York Times the way I did, might have found the Smoot-Hawley answer. But I think what happened with Galbraith is that he was so far along in his career by the time he had come to write *The Great Crash, 1929*, he probably had a research assistant looking at the microfilm who didn't notice that there was something going on there. So he had to come up with a theory of why the market crashed, and it was a theory that the market crashed because it was too high.

*In other words, it's a nonexplanation. While the forces may be operating—greed is certainly part of life—it doesn't explain what actually triggered the crash?*

Right. The crash of '29 was triggered by the recognition on the part of the world markets that the United States was more likely at the end of the last week of October 1929 than it was at the beginning of the week to impose protectionist trade-barriers on world commerce. And so the Dow-Jones industrial average fell from its peak of 381 around Labor Day of 1929 to a low of 230 in the last week of October. Of course, this was only the first wave. Other countries retaliated against Smoot-Hawley with protectionist tariffs of their own. So you had an imploding of world trade that sent the world reeling backward, giving up perhaps 30 years' worth of progress. And we had to go through a depression and a world war in order to get to a higher state.

One of the things that's frightened me throughout the current period is that although supply-siders like me believed they knew what was going on, they were confronting a world of policy makers who didn't. We believed that unless we could act rapidly enough, we could wind up having the world break down into a global depression that would lead to a nuclear war. The global electorate has to keep its wits about it and move to avoid the same kind of cataclysm we had in the 1930's and 1940's.

*A lot of people now are drawing the parallels between '29 and '87. We've had a boom, a stock market crash, and now the question on everyone's mind is, Where do we go from here? Is a recession or even a depression unavoidable?*

The adverse effects of the crash of '29 could have been avoided. The market expectations of October 1929 were that bad

things were going to happen in the future. Now if Hoover hadn't signed the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act, or if foreign retaliation had not followed and further diminished commerce, something very different might have occurred. And remember, this diminution of commerce brought Government revenues down in the United States so much that Hoover said we had to raise taxes to make up for the lost revenues. One error built upon another error until we got to the low point of the Dow-Jones Average, 41, that was hit in the summer of 1932. It was within days of Roosevelt's nomination in Chicago and his acceptance speech with its commitment to free trade.

*Which was a flat repudiation of Hoover and the Republicans as the party of protectionism and isolationism.*

Exactly. Our ruling elite didn't see, in 1929, how important it was that we be international in our approach, how important it was that in being a global leader, we not act as we had in the previous periods of our growing up, as narrow nationalists. In earlier days we could get away with pushing tariffs up and down and had done so. But we were in a far different position by the 1920's.

*What had changed?*

The United States in the 1920s was already the richest country in the world. We were booming on the supply-side ideas of Andrew Mellon, the Secretary of the Treasury, and Presidents Harding and Coolidge. We were growing at a great pace, and the rest of the world was kind of drawing water and hewing wood in support of our boom. But historically this kind of disequilibrium can't go on for very long. Either we were going to have to become poorer or they had to become richer.

The correct solution back in the late twenties, rather than the one we chose through the Smoot-Hawley Tariff Act—which made us poorer—was to share these growth ideas with the rest of the world. I'm not talking about sharing through the distribution of goods, by sending foreign aid out of the United States. I'm talking about sending ideas out. We are now getting a second run at this global leadership. Now, I hope, we're going to be able to meet the challenge.

*You mention the Mellon tax cuts of the twenties, which are one of the inspirations, certainly, for the whole supply-side revival in economics. Those tax cuts, and the boom that followed, actually increased Government revenues to the point where there were regular surpluses. In that period the national debt declined by some 30 percent. Why didn't the Reagan tax cuts of our era achieve the same ends?*

A couple of things. One is that there was no social safety-net system in the 1920s. So when the crash occurred, Andrew Mellon said, well, you liquidate capital; you liquidate labor; you just liquidate things until you get back to a new equilibrium. But that meant that the poorest people in the country were crushed in the process. You can't do that today—and shouldn't. The second thing is that in the 1920s we were on a gold standard. That meant that monetary policy was acting at an optimum rate.

Now we have a floating currency, where monetary errors can be made and have been. We have a monetary deflation that brought the price a gold down very sharply from when Reagan was elected—from \$620 to less than \$300 in the summer of 1982. So we wound up with a recession, and this process brought the big deficits. Supply-siders were warning in the early 1980s that unless

the Federal Reserve System was prevented from tightening monetary policy in 1981 and 1982, as it did, we would wind up with colossal budget deficits.

Recession in the kind of welfare state we have arranged is enormously expensive. The safety net is a good thing, but it costs. So supply-siders have been arguing from the beginning of the Reagan administration that at all cost recession must be avoided.

*So, in your view, the budget deficits are a consequence not of tax cuts but of a restrictive monetary policy that triggered a recession in 1982. In any event, for years now, we have been running the highest deficits in our history, and we have a two-trillion-dollar national debt. Many suggest that the crash of October 1987 was in response to this. Is that right? How serious are the budget deficits? How serious is the national debt?*

Again, the greatest threat to our deficits and our national debt is recession. The two-trillion-dollar national debt is not something that supply-siders are frightened by, because we have seen the tremendous addition, over the last several years, to the asset side of the ledger. The value of past savings, the value of financial assets to the United States, has risen by a phenomenal amount. It should make it relatively easy to finance the deficit, as long as we get it under control at some point. Now getting it under control at some point means not having any more recessions for a while. Not engineering them, certainly.

*Doesn't history offer some comfort in terms of the debt and the budget deficits? They've increased tremendously in nominal terms, but as a proportion of gross national product or—as you just pointed out—as a proportion of assets, they're roughly what they were twenty-five years ago.*

And they are much lower than they were at the end of World War II. At that time the publicly held national debt in the United States was something on the order of 120 percent of GNP. In other words, the whole country would have to work for fifteen months in order to pay off the national debt completely. At the present moment the publicly held national debt is something less than 50 percent of GNP, which means we would have to work six months to pay off the creditors.

*What about the trade deficit?*

We've become the world's greatest debtor because of the enormous capital inflows that have come into the United States as a result of supply-side growth policies. When we were beginning to sell the idea of encouraging the wealth of nations by getting tax rates down to an optimum level, we pointed out that if we did this first in the United States, we would quickly have to get the rest of the world to replicate our policies. Otherwise, capital would flow to the United States. And capital can flow to the United States not only if we run a trade deficit. A trade deficit is the flip side of a capital inflow.

If Japanese investors see that profit opportunities are greater in the United States than they are in Japan, they will sell us more goods than they're buying from us so that the differential can be used to buy financial assets. In other words, they can't buy stocks or bonds or hotels on Central Park South unless they sell us more goods than they're buying from us. So the capital inflow is huge today because we're a magnet for capital worldwide.

*Why did this happen?*

Because the United States, under President Reagan, had to grope its way out of

the world of the 1970s—the world of stagflation—by cutting taxes. With the tax reform of 1986, the United States will have a top tax rate of 28 percent. This makes us, as The Wall Street Journal put it, the biggest tax haven in the world. And it is the capital flowing in that produces these enormous trade deficits.

The only solution to this disequilibrium is a recession in the United States or tax reforms in the rest of the world. Governments should bring the tax rates down in Europe and Japan and even more in the Third World. The highest tax rates in the world now are in Central America, South America, and sub-Saharan Africa, where no economic activity can really take place, because as soon as any occurs that's visible to the tax collector, the government confiscates the profits.

*The common wisdom today says that the trade deficits and the budget deficits are looming over the economy in America, that they are the fundamental problems this economy faces. And according to many, they're a function of irresponsible tax cuts.*

Those who make that argument are essentially correct, except that they're talking from the standpoint of those who would correct the problems by having a depression. They're part of the wrong solution—the one we really don't want to choose. Even those who are saying, "We must have a recession to correct the disequilibrium," can be faintly heard every now and then saying, "Well, yes, Germany and Japan should expand." But it's a kind of weak call, because they don't really understand the supply-side position. They know that there's something to what we say, but they're far more convinced of their own solution. So they say, "Even though we may have to go through some pain, better do it now than later, before it gets worse."

But I think that as long as we have a sense that we can get past these current difficulties, we'll be okay—if President Reagan can hang on with his commitment to keeping us out of recession through the rest of his term. Which means, as he puts it, to not allow deleterious tax increases to slow the economy down, to not permit protectionist trade legislation to be enacted, and to not get caught up in some great monetary error.

*So, what triggered the crash of '87?*

The feeling, worldwide, that the President has lost his dominant position in being able to manage this great economy. And the perception that the Congress of the United States, controlled by the Democratic party—which at this point in history is a party of pessimists—believes we must have trade legislation, we must have tax increases, we must even have a recession. All these threats are the real ogres now hanging over the market as a result of the world market's loss of confidence in President Reagan's ability to manage things.

*But how do we solve the problem of the trade deficits? Let the dollar fall into oblivion?*

No. Letting the dollar fall is inflationary. We could get into a 1979-80 cycle, in which the markets would see the value of financial assets evaporate in a monetary inflation.

*That would be a trade war by other means, wouldn't it?*

Yes. There are three major threats to the economy: a monetary inflation; increased taxation that could bring about a recession by reducing domestic profit opportunities; and increasing tariff walls through protectionist trade legislation that could reduce and diminish the United States as a magnet

for capital. These three things could bring about the kind of recession that would make up poor enough to correct the trade deficit.

See, once you're poor enough, you can't afford the goods of the rest of the world, so you don't buy them. You're even too poor to buy the goods that you've produced yourself. So you sell them at going-out-of-business prices to the rest of the world. You have a fire sale. All of a sudden you have huge trade surpluses. This is what happened in the 1930s in the United States. Every month, month after month, the Department of Commerce would announce, "Well, the unemployment rate has gone up, but the good news is that the trade surplus has gotten bigger." We ran a trade surplus throughout the Depression.

*So a trade surplus is not necessarily a sign of economic well-being?*

No, it's not. You have to be able to look at the conditions. The trade surplus after World War I and after World War II was a sign of great strength in the United States, because the rest of the world was buying goods from us in order to rebuild, giving us financial assets in exchange. But now the trade deficit that we're having is a sign of great vitality because the capital inflows are arising out of the fact that we now have enacted the lowest tax rates on individuals in the world and we have become a magnet for capital. There is a great potential now for producing enough wealth to pay off the investments of the rest of the world, down the line. The rest of the world is really buying income streams; they're buying annuities here.

I think the only real solution to the trade deficits and the budget deficits is to go back again, again and again, to persuade the rest of the Western industrial democracies to reduce their tax rates, to expand. Not to reflate but to grow.

When we talk to the Germans now, all they seem to hear us saying is that they should increase their budget deficits and inflate their money supplies. And they're afraid of doing that because they think it will lead to inflation. But supply-siders are not saying that. We're talking about having them bring down their marginal income tax rates. They have a 56 percent top rate in Germany. Now they've promised to bring it down, by 1990, to 53 percent. But that's not enough. And it's not only Germany and Japan. I met with Treasury Secretary Baker a few weeks ago, and I told him, "You've got to get Germany and Japan to lower their tax rates, not just because those two countries are the problem but because they would serve then as models for Europe and Asia." Once Germany cuts its tax rates, then the rest of the European community would have to, in order to compete with Germany.

*What would happen if they did not follow the German lead?*

The Germans would have tremendous capital inflows. They would then switch from a trade-surplus country to a trade deficit country. There's another, human dimension here too. Unless they were followed quickly by the rest of Europe in getting tax rates down, the Germans would then have to import workers from Italy and Turkey—guest workers—to come in and perform the work, just as now we have pressures in the United States with these great capital inflows to import people from the rest of the world to do the work.

The political disequilibrium is horrendous. Imagine, in the ridiculous extreme, that the United States was the only country in the



world applying a correct economic policy. Then the only solution for the rest of the world would be to move to the United States. Everyone would come to the United States eventually if you had open immigration and if tax rates were 100 percent around the rest of the world and they were at optimum here. But we shouldn't have to do that. We shouldn't have to import the rest of the world just because we're the only land of opportunity.

Our mission is to serve as a beacon to the rest of the world, so that we can export our ideas. People in Mexico shouldn't have to move to San Diego to fulfill themselves. They should be able to stay where they are, with their families, their friends, their roots, their background and their culture. That is the objective of the 1990s. This is the challenge for the next American President and the growth leaders in the United States and in the Western world: to export the ideas of growth so that we solve the problems by having the rest of the world grow, not by having the United States decline.

*That's the challenge. But what do you think will really happen?*

The crash we had in October 1987 was a good dose of ice water, even on those growth-oriented politicians and businessmen who have come to take it all for granted and who may have brushed aside the idea that we have to worry about the rest of the world, believing that we can be an island of prosperity in a world of either semiprospersity or poverty. The world won't let that happen. The global electorate won't let that happen.

Even if 98 percent of the world is prosperous and 2 percent somewhere has still not been brought aboard—and I can imagine this happening centuries from now—that 2 percent will give the rest of the world great headaches until we resolve that. They have to be brought up to the next stage. That's the march of history, the way I see it.

So in the long run, and in the short run, I'm very optimistic. I think this time around, the United States is going to side-step protectionist trade legislation. We're going to avoid a recession. And we're going, in 1988, to choose a political leader who will be able to deal with the rest of the world problem. But the margins for error have narrowed. It's a very sporty course out there.

#### UNITED STATES-SOVIET EXCHANGES

**HON. CHRISTOPHER H. SMITH**

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SMITH of New Jersey. Mr. Speaker, yesterday I had the privilege of offering the "congressional perspective" on exchanges between the United States and the Soviet Union at a conference with top Soviets including Soviet Culture Minister Vasily G. Zakharov. The debate/dialog was sponsored by the Eisenhower Institute and Helsinki Commission on which I serve, and provided a useful exchange of ideas, hopes, as well as criticisms of such exchanges. It seems clear to me that both the United States and the Soviet Union are acting in their own self interest in promoting exchanges of various kinds and this is no

different today than it was 30 years ago on June 27, 1958, when the first agreement was signed by President Eisenhower and Nikita Khrushchev.

The United States, for its part, hopes that the effect of sustained interface with a robust democracy, guaranteed protection of human rights, due process of law, a free media, an independent judiciary and a free market system will impress Soviet leaders, at least incrementally, that these basic tenets of American life do indeed work effectively and are not to be regarded with trepidation or suspicion. Lest we be too confident about the immediate positive impact of our values on Soviet leaders, we do well to note Mikhail Tsypkin's testimony at a recent Helsinki Commission hearing. He said:

There is no established correlation between visiting a democratic society and becoming a democrat. On the one hand, Lenin, the father of Soviet Communism, spent most of his adult life in Great Britain and Switzerland, and he had nothing but contempt for democratic values. On the other hand, the most active proponent of democracy in the Soviet Union, Dr. Andrei Sakharov, has never been out of the Soviet Union. \* \* \*

But then again Dr. Sakharov has had the advantage of 20-20 hindsight observing the devastating results and being victimized by a 70-year-old experiment called communism that has littered the Soviet Union with much human misery and pain. For Lenin, at least before 1917, communism was an idea and he saw communism only in its infancy and even that, however, was a nightmare.

I would note here that there are many informed Americans who, while cautiously embracing U.S. Soviet exchanges, believe that the Soviet Union is accelerating certain types of contact with the United States for purely pragmatic reasons that could prove injurious to United States security. There are many who believe that the bottom line for the Soviets is to acquire Western technology for both economic and military purposes. There is much to this argument. As Richard Perle, former Assistant Secretary of Defense for International and Security Policy, has warned:

The unhappy fact is that we have no policy, no deliberate sense of gains and losses, no orderly interagency process for evaluating risks—"assessing the implications for our national security of cooperative arrangements with Soviet intelligence agents and their co-opted scientific and technical colleagues"—and benefits.

These are sobering thoughts. Representatives from both sides, however, repeatedly assert that such exchanges should be on specific formats for exchanges are designed to promote mutual understanding, mutual respect, sharing of information and a corresponding lessening of tensions, prejudices, and misperceptions that exacerbate relations. These certainly are laudable goals.

I believe there is an undue emphasis by the Soviets on the need for establishing a certain aura of symmetry between various institutions in both countries. While I have been very critical of agreements like the 1985 American Bar Association and the Association of Soviet Lawyers—ABA/ASL accord, I think the jury is

still out in the minds of many Americans—and Congressmen—as to the advisability of such formal agreements. While the ABA is comprised of attorneys dedicated to the rule of law—and a fair trial for their clients—the ASL is subordinate to the Communist Party, and presents the Soviet human rights record and legal system to the West in favorable light. The ASL is not an independent, autonomous organization. Its vice president, Samuil Zivs, who also serves as vice-president of the Soviet Anti-Zionist Committee, has been severely critical of Anatoly Shcharansky and Dr. Sakharov and accused Amnesty International of "poisoning peoples' minds with disinformation about the Soviet Union".

At a 3-day meeting in Holland in early January, I asked Mr. Alexander Sukharev, president of ASL several specific questions concerning the due process rights of accused Soviet citizens. I asked him if basic due process rights exist in the Soviet Union, such as the right of counsel and a presumption of innocence until proven guilty. My questions went unanswered. Perhaps more dialog will induce more introspection and will yield reform in Soviet jurisprudence. But that dialog could have proceeded absent the agreement conferring "equality" between the two organizations.

One of the issues that I raised repeatedly in Holland with Theodore Burlatsky and Alexander Sukharev was the need for an amnesty for persecuted Christians and other people of faith during the celebration of the millennium. I believe that an amnesty, and a liberalization of Soviet law permitting freer exercise of religion, contact and exchanges of coreligionists in the West would establish a real basis for growth in relations between our two countries. If exchanges of religious leaders are permitted only for peace conferences, or nuclear disarmament talks, the view will persist here in the Congress that such contact is permitted primarily to serve Soviet propaganda purposes. What we hope the Soviets will consider is the freer contact and exchange of church leaders on issues of theology, social justice and other topics.

It is also hoped that the Soviet Government will permit freer travel at home and abroad of its own citizens and allow Americans—particularly those with family ties—to visit and stay with relatives in their own residences. Congress is really interested in this issue. Last year Congress passed a resolution I introduced calling on the Soviet Union to permit this kind of contact between family members. This right is guaranteed by the Helsinki accords and its implementation would dramatically enhance mutual understanding and respect between our two countries.

I believe that Americans who visit the Soviet Union as part of an exchange should be permitted freer access to Soviet citizens without the latter fearing retribution. Isolating the general Soviet population from face-to-face contact only reinforces the contention that the Soviet Union is a closed society. I think mutual understanding will be further advanced if younger students, especially those of high school age, are permitted to study in the United States and Soviet Union for extended

periods of time. The young should be permitted—let me rephrase that, not just permitted but positively encouraged—to seek the truth, to ask probing questions and demand answers. And if they are so inclined, to dissent, without inviting the ire of Soviet officials.

Finally, let me just say that there is a strong undercurrent of guarded optimism on the part of many Americans concerning the hope of "glasnost" and "perestroika" in the Soviet Union. Exchanges can play a part in initiatives and furthering democratization in the USSR and bringing the two superpowers closer.

I dare say that the one exchange that Americans would most like to see however, isn't horizontal—that is to say—East/West. But rather an ongoing meaningful vertical exchange—Soviet citizen to Soviet Government and vice versa.

There is a strong belief here in the Congress that any country that keeps its word with its own citizenry—that is, respects human rights of its people—is indeed a country that can be trusted on matters of international importance and is worthy of our deep and abiding respect.

#### YOUNG WOMEN PROMOTE TENNESSEE HONEY

#### HON. DON SUNDQUIST

OF TENNESSEE

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. SUNDQUIST. Mr. Speaker, I would like to take just a moment to call the attention of my colleagues to accomplishments of two young constituents of mine, Miss Donna Nicholson, of Clarksville, TN, and Miss Stacey Green, of Dickson, TN.

The two of them were recently selected to represent and promote Tennessee's beekeeping and honey-making industry, Miss Nicholson as 1988 "Tennessee Honey Queen" and Miss Green as "1988 Tennessee Honey Princess."

It may surprise some of my colleagues to learn that the business of making honey generates \$19 billion annually in this country. As Donna and Stacey are quick to tell you, there is much to recommend this wholesome, natural product.

Donna Nicholson and Stacey Green have been honored by the Tennessee State Beekeepers Association because of their enthusiastic promotion of honey and because they are themselves practicing beekeepers.

Our "1988 Tennessee Honey Queen and Princess" are to be congratulated, not only because they are fine representatives for Tennessee honey, but also because these fine young women embody so well the ideals of industry, ingenuity, thrift, and selflessness promoted by the Tennessee Honey Queen program.

I congratulate Donna Nicholson and Stacey Green and wish them well as they pursue their educations and careers.

#### NATIONAL BURN AWARENESS WEEK

#### HON. BENJAMIN A. GILMAN

OF NEW YORK

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. GILMAN. Mr. Speaker, I would like to draw my colleague's attention to the week of February 8, 1988, "National Burn Awareness Week." As many of us are aware, burns are one of the leading causes of death in the United States, with almost 12,000 people dying each year as a result of burns, a majority of them children, the elderly, and the disabled.

Each year millions of dollars are spent trying to remedy the effects of burns and burn-related incidents; each year, 70,000 individuals are hospitalized as a result of burns. Fortunately, a special group of individuals have devoted themselves to helping burned children, conducting burn research and training medical personnel in the treatment of burn injuries. The Shriners of North America have committed themselves to improving the quality of life for burned children.

Recognizing that thousands of children are crippled, disfigured or killed each year by what has been called one of the largest hazards of children, the Shrine of North America opened three burn institutes in Boston, Cincinnati and Galveston, providing excellent care to severely burned children requiring immediate acute care, reconstructive or restorative surgery, and rehabilitation from severe burns. Almost unbelievably, there is never a charge to the patient or parent for any service or medical treatment received at Shriners Hospitals.

The Shriners burn institutes have been in the vanguard of burn research. One of the better known achievements of Shriners Hospitals research is the cultured skin developed by the Boston Burn Institute. Researchers developed a method of growing skin from a tiny sample of a burn patient's own skin. They are currently involved in the development of artificial skin and many other achievements that will continue to revolutionize the way burn patients will be treated in the future.

The establishment of the Shriners burns institutes has alerted the medical community about the needs of burn patients, and in turn, led to the establishment of non-Shrine burn centers throughout North America. In my district, many Shriners and other concerned individuals devote their energy to the burn unit at the Westchester County Hospital.

Throughout this week, the Shriners and many other members of my community will be conducting public awareness programs designed to familiarize the community with methods of burn prevention, treatment and rehabilitation, as well as educating the public of fire hazards, and thereby reducing the incidence of burn injury. I applaud the Shriners for their efforts and hope that "National Burn Awareness Week" receives as much attention in every district in the Nation.

#### GIVE DEMOCRACY A CHANCE

#### HON. ALFRED A. (AL) McCANDLESS

OF CALIFORNIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. McCANDLESS. Mr. Speaker, few issues are debated at such length and as passionately as the issue of aid for the freedom fighters in Nicaragua, also known as the Contras. I support aid to the freedom fighters. Their goal is to force the Sandinista government to honor the promises of the Sandinista revolution—promises of freedom and democracy for a troubled Central American country. However, those promises have been ignored. The Sandinistas have closed opposition newspapers and radio stations, and other basic freedoms and human rights are nonexistent in Nicaragua. In short, the Sandinistas have replaced their promises of freedom and democracy with Marxist-Leninist ideology and an announced objective of spreading a socialist revolution throughout the region.

Contra aid has been successful. Without Contra aid, there would be no negotiations between the Sandinistas and the freedom fighters; there would be no recently opened opposition newspaper or radio station; and, most importantly, there would be no hope of democracy. We must keep the pressure on the Sandinista government to honor the promises of their revolution. We must support the Nicaraguan freedom fighters. We must give democracy a chance.

In the February 1, 1988, issue of U.S. News & World Report, was an excellent and concise article on why it is "Time for a 'Yes' Vote on the Contra Aid." I commend the article to the careful consideration of my colleagues.

[From U.S. News & World Report, Feb. 1, 1988]

#### TIME FOR A "YES" VOTE ON CONTRA AID

(By Michael Kramer)

Take a moment and think about the value of pressure in international relations. Consider two examples:

Despite Moscow's internal economic problems, can any competent student of Soviet affairs seriously argue that an INF treaty would exist today if the Reagan administration hadn't insisted on placing Pershing 2 missiles in Europe? If the allies had had nothing to trade, would the Kremlin have unilaterally dismantled its intermediate nuclear forces out of the goodness of its heart?

Similarly, on their southern flank, would the Soviets be eager to quit Afghanistan simply because Russian mothers sleep better if their sons aren't occupying another county? If the United States hadn't backed the mujaheddin rebels to the point where Afghanistan has become a Vietnam-style quagmire for Moscow, would Mikhail Gorbachev be planning a pullout simply for altruistic reasons?

The answer to these questions is obvious or should be: Pressure—and often only pressure—works.

Now consider the Nicaraguan situation. Contra aid faces another crucial vote week. Congressional opponents of renewed assistance say the Sandinistas have seen the light. The comandantes, they argue, have agreed to speak directly to the Contras (which they had previously refused to do),



lift the state of emergency in Nicaragua and grant a conditional amnesty to political prisoners essentially because they are well-intentioned folks who would have "made nice" long ago if the Contras hadn't been nipping at their heels.

This is the view, too, of the Democrats running for President (new crowd, old tune)—candidates, in Jeane Kirkpatrick's admittedly demagogic phrase, who always seem to blame America first. And, of course, their critique is 180 degrees wrong. There is a connection between the INF treaty, Afghanistan and the chances for peace in Central America—a common thread: By their own, proud admission, the Sandinistas are dedicated Communists committed to spreading their Marxist-Leninist ideology throughout the region they inhabit. That they now may be moderating their thinking and behavior at all-an iffy proposition at best—is a result of the pressure, both real and prospective, that the Contras have been able to apply.

#### HOW THE SANDINISTAS PLAY THE GAME

The Sandinistas must be chuckling. Last week, after they announced their "concessions"—which they promised to renounce if Washington continues aid to the Contras—Nicaragua's Foreign Minister was asked if the comandantes were loosening their iron fist for tactical reasons: In order to influence Congress to reject further Contra assistance. "Of course," answered Miguel D'Escoto, a confident practitioner of pressure in perfect sync with his audience. Congress' Democrats, you see, are still anxious to kill off the one factor that has caused the comandantes to move off square one.

Why is the obvious course—keeping the Contras alive—even a matter of debate? Part of the blame rests squarely with the Reagan administration. Over seven years, the White House has squandered its credibility with respect to Central America. It has lied to Congress, shifted its goals and misread the mood inside Nicaragua. The upside is that the Sandinistas have been contained and that the time bought by that containment has permitted the consolidation of democracy elsewhere in the region, most notably in El Salvador. But President Duarte's limited success there—and the fragility of representative government in Guatemala and Honduras—only raises the stakes further if the Contras are disbanded.

#### ARIAS' FALLBACK: A FEW GOOD MEN

Today's anti-Contra lobby echoes an earlier naïveté when Americans, circa 1979, actually believed that Thomas Jefferson was the Sandinista patron saint. "Give peace a chance," they now say. "Trust the latest democratic pronouncements of Nicaragua's President, Daniel Ortega." If we're wrong, says House Democratic Whip Tony Coelho, then the four other Central American Presidents will come to us and "seek some help—and we should give it to them."

What kind of help? Oscar Arias, the Costa Rican President who authored the current peace proposal, has told friends that an invasion by the U.S. Marines would fit the bill. Which is fine for him to say. He's not talking about Costa Ricans making Central America safe for democracy; he's talking about our boys doing the job, the same job the Contras—native Nicaraguans—are willing to do themselves.

Even the most politically blind should feel queasy about the Sandinistas' latest good-guy promises and should welcome the Contras as an insurance policy. Cut them off now, and they will be gone for good. Once

disbanded, a guerrilla force—no matter how dedicated—is next to impossible to reconstitute. And once a nation like the United States has turned its attention elsewhere, it doesn't want to hear that a problem deemed "solved" is still an open wound.

The prudent course for Congress, then, is to keep the Contras alive. Any one of a number of proposals will suffice. Two of these—humanitarian assistance, or military aid held in escrow against a determination of the Sandinistas' sincerity—would get the job done. If we don't do at least this—and it really isn't all that much—where will we complain if things turn sour? The United Nations?

If the Contras die, the Sandinistas will be free to reimpose the near-Stalinist measures they claim to be forgoing and to fulfill their "historical imperative" by striking out against their neighbors. And then Oscar Arias will be right: Only the Marines will be left as an available counterforce, assuming whoever is President has the stomach to send them in—a bet even a loser like Jimmy the Greek wouldn't take.

#### IN THE INTEREST OF PEACE AND FREEDOM, SUPPORT THE RESISTANCE

#### HON. STEVE GUNDERSON

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. GUNDERSON. Mr. Speaker, today the Congress debates again the direction of United States policy in Central America. The outcome of the vote will determine whether the historic Guatemala City peace plan remains a vital instrument toward peace and freedom, or simply fades away as another missed opportunity for Central America.

As one who at first opposed military aid to the Nicaraguan resistance, I rise in support of the assistance package before us today. It was true, at one time, that there were other options for the United States to pursue in trying to promote stability and freedom in Central America. It could also be said that the United States had no business supporting a group like the Contras.

But as we debate this issue today, we must recognize that the times have changed, the Contras have changed, and the issue before us has changed.

The events over the past few months ought to give all of us a new perspective on the Central American question. The most salient issue, of course, has been the Guatemala City peace plan, which was signed by the five Presidents in the region in August. This plan holds the governments to a variety of far-reaching reforms, including amnesty for insurgents, cease-fire negotiations, basic freedoms, release of political prisoners, suspensions of state-of-emergency laws, cessation of support for insurgents, and other provisions.

Those of us who support this plan have been encouraged by the hope and dynamism engendered by this document. It has sparked a process by which the Central American people might achieve not just peace alone, but peace together with freedom.

The Nicaraguan resistance, unlike other insurgencies in the region, seeks to participate

fully in this process, and in the new environment built by that process. No longer can we dismiss the resistance in broadbrush terms, as some unwashed, disorganized band of thugs. Their leadership is made up of men and women who fought to overthrow Somoza, served in the postrevolution coalition government, and then joined the resistance when the Sandinistas moved to consolidate their power.

The Contras are the only insurgency today, and possibly ever, with its own human rights group. The Nicaraguan Association for Human Rights [ANPDH], led by Dr. Marta Patricia Balciano, educates the resistance as to the principles of the Geneva Convention, and monitors their human rights record. When Contras commit serious crimes out in the field, they are brought to trial before a military tribunal, and they serve time in military prison when found guilty.

We must consider the President's aid package within the context of this new environment. This package was explicitly designed to support the peace process, rather than undermine it or exacerbate the Nicaraguan conflict. The President's proposal consists of \$36 million in direct aid to the Contras. Ninety percent of this package is nonlethal assistance, meaning food, clothing, medicine, transport, and other supplies. The remainder, \$3.6 million in lethal aid, will be held in escrow until March 31, and would only be released if the Congress determined that the Sandinistas were not in compliance with the peace plan. I should emphasize that this package consists of reprogrammed funds, and requires no new money.

In view of the evolution of this issue, the central question we must answer today is which policy will continue the process toward achieving peace, freedom, and democracy?

Sandinista leader Daniel Ortega suggests we eliminate the Contras; then he will allow freedom and democracy. President Reagan argues the opposite, that the vitality of the resistance is what is pressuring the Sandinistas toward those goals.

A cursory review of history provides some valuable insight. It is inarguable that the Soviets would never have agreed to the terms of the INF Treaty were it not for the presence of American Pershing II and cruise missiles in Europe. The Soviets would never be willing to negotiate their withdrawal from Afghanistan were it not for the strong stand of the mujahedin rebels, supported in part by the United States.

The analogy rings true for Nicaragua. Daniel Ortega would never have signed an agreement instituting comprehensive democratic reforms were it not for the Contras. Two weeks ago, in the face of censure from the other four Central American Presidents and another Contra aid vote in Congress, he finally offered direct talks with the resistance and lifted the state of emergency.

How did the Sandinistas behave in response to 4 months of moral pressure by the Central American Presidents after the signing of the peace plan? The record shows:

In September, they worked out a plan with Soviet and Cuban assistance, to construct a 600,000-man armed force equipped with modern, offensive weapons. El Salvador, with

a force of 46,000, is the next largest army in the region.

During September and October, the Sandinistas trained members of the Salvadoran guerrillas in the use of antiaircraft weapons.

On December 12, President Ortega told supporters in Managua that if by chance the Sandinista Party lost an election, "what it would give up would be the government, not the power." At present, the army, the judiciary, and the law enforcement agencies are controlled by the Sandinista Party as a matter of structure.

Of the more than 9,000 political prisoners held by the Sandinistas, only 985 have been released. By comparison, El Salvador has released all its political prisoners, including the kidnappers of President Duarte's own daughter and the murderers of American soldiers, land reform experts, and union officials.

The list goes on, and includes the arrests and mistreatment of civic opposition leaders, intimidation and repression of opposition media, and other human rights violations. In fact, the Sandinistas fall short at every point of the Guatemala City plan.

The vote today, then, is not a vote to give peace a chance. The vote today is really this: Should we do our part to ensure the existence of a viable political opposition within Nicaragua? For if the resistance loses its support, they will disband, and we will lose the one effective pressure that keeps Mr. Ortega at the cease-fire talks table and compels him to institute reforms. Without a viable Contra existence, I just don't envision the Sandinistas contributing to stability in the region, nor can I see them treating their people with respect, if they feel their grip on power is assured.

Finally, we must also understand what is not at stake here. The peace process is in no danger of crumbling as a result of this aid package. Only a few days go during his tour of Europe, Daniel Ortega announced that the cease-fire talks would proceed, and that the peace process would continue, whether or not Congress approved the Contra aid package. Today's vote is not a vote to end the peace process; it is instead a vote to preserve the hope of peace, freedom, and democracy.

## INF TREATY PRIMER

### HON. LOUIS STOKES

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, February 3, 1988

Mr. STOKES. Mr. Speaker, the recently-concluded treaty between the United States and the Soviet Union on the elimination of intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles is an important matter of interest to all Members of Congress. To assist Members in understanding the key elements of that treaty, I am enclosing a gist with the key elements of that treaty.

## INF TREATY PRIMER

### TREATY ON THE ELIMINATION OF INTERMEDIATE-RANGE AND SHORTER-RANGE MISSILES

#### Article I

Article I requires the permanent elimination of U.S. and Soviet intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles as defined in this Treaty.

#### Article II

This article defines the key terms used in the Treaty. Definitions are provided for the terms: ground-launched ballistic missile (GLBM), ground-launched cruise missile (GLCM), GLBM launcher, GLCM launcher, intermediate-range missile, shorter-range missile, deployment area, missile operating base, missile support facility, transit, deployed missile, non-deployed missile, deployed launcher, non-deployed launcher, and basing country.

#### Article III

Article III specifies the existing missile systems to be destroyed. For the United States, it is Pershing II and the BGM-109G Ground-Launched Cruise Missile (GLCM). For the Soviet Union, it is the SS-20, SS-4, and SS-5. The shorter-range systems that are to be destroyed is the Pershing IA for the United States and for the Soviet Union, the SS-12 and SS-23.

NOTE: The Soviet SSC-X-4 (GLCM) and the U.S. Pershing IB which are also to be eliminated are not categorized as existing types of missile but rather as "missile systems tested but not deployed prior to entry into force of the treaty" and therefore are not listed under Article III. Article X requires that they be eliminated within the first six months after entry into force of the Treaty.

#### Article IV

Paragraph 1: Both parties will eliminate all its intermediate-range missiles and launchers, as well as all its support equipment for these weapons no later than three years after entry into force of this Treaty.

Paragraph 2: The reductions will be in two phases. The purpose of the two phases is to insure that neither side obtains a numerical superiority by delaying their reductions. The first phase is to take no longer than 29 months from the entry into force of the Treaty. At the end of those 29 months, each party can have deployed on intermediate ballistic missile launchers, missiles having no more than a total of 171 warheads. Deployed intermediate ballistic missiles (those in launchers, plus spares) can carry no more than a total of 180 warheads. The total of deployed and non-deployed intermediate ballistic missile launchers cannot carry a total number of missiles having more than a maximum of 200 warheads. Furthermore, as the eliminations proceed, the ratio of intermediate ballistic missiles to GLCMs must remain as they were on 1 November 1987 during this phase.

The second phase consists of the last seven months of the three year period in which the remaining ballistic missile launchers, missiles, as well as cruise missiles, will be eliminated. NOTE: The Protocol on Eliminations required that the preceding be completed within six and a half months. The remaining 15 days of the seven months is reserved for the removal and elimination of the U.S.-controlled warheads on the West German Pershing IA missiles.

#### Article V

Paragraphs 1 required the elimination of all shorter-range missiles and launchers, as well as support equipment, no later than 18 months after entry into force of the Treaty.

Paragraph 2 specifies that no later than 90 days after entry into force of the Treaty, all deployed shorter-range missiles and deployed and non-deployed launchers of such missiles are to be removed from their operating bases and sent to the designated elimination facilities where they will remain until their destruction within 18 months

under the procedures set forth in the Protocol on Elimination. No later than 12 months after entry into force of the Treaty, all non-deployed shorter-range missiles are to be eliminated in accordance with the Protocol on Elimination.

Paragraph 3 specifies that shorter-range missiles and launchers shall not be located at the same elimination facility and such facilities shall be separated by no less than 1,000 kilometers.

#### Article VI

This article bans the flight testing or production of the weapons prohibited by this Treaty.

Section 2 gives each party the right to produce a type of ballistic missile not limited by this Treaty which uses a stage that is outwardly similar to, but not interchangeable with, a stage of an existing type of intermediate ballistic missile. This permits the continued production of the first stage of the SS-25 missile which is similar, in outward appearance, to the first stage of the SS-20 missile.

#### Article VII

This article contains twelve paragraphs which set technical parameters for the definitions of what are, or are not, intermediate-range and shorter-range ballistic missiles and Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles subject to elimination by the Treaty.

Paragraphs 1, 2 and 4 define all Ground-Launched Ballistic Missiles (GLBM) and Ground-Launched Cruise Missiles (GLCM) as intermediate-range missiles banned by the Treaty if they have been tested for weapons delivery within a range of 1,000 to 5,000 kilometers and shorter-range missiles banned by the Treaty if they have been tested within a range of 500 to 1,000 kilometers.

Paragraph 3 permits GLBMs with ranges of 500 to 5,000 kilometers if they are solely for defense against objects in space.

Paragraph 11 exempts ballistic and cruise missiles from being defined as missiles banned by the Treaty as long as they are tested from fixed land-based launchers distinguishable from the launchers banned by the Treaty and are subsequently used in other than a ground-based mode.

Paragraph 12 permits each party to have the right to produce and use booster systems which might be considered intermediate-range or shorter-range missiles banned by the Treaty as long as each party launches them only from fixed launchers located at research and development sites listed in Section V of the Memorandum of Understanding. The total booster inventory for each side cannot exceed 35 at any one time. Furthermore, the research and development launch sites are off-limits to on-site inspections.

#### Article VIII

Article VIII requires both parties to locate all the systems to be eliminated by this Treaty at the facilities designated in the Memorandum of Understanding. Furthermore, it requires that the transient time for a weapon from its deployment area to its elimination facility cannot be longer than 25 days. Additionally, the article specifies that within 30 days after entry into force of the Treaty, no missile can be located at a production facility or test range.

#### Article IX

This article sets up provisions for the exchange of data and timeframes for notification of certain events that occur in the elimination of the INF weapons.



Paragraph 2 states that the data exchanges and updates, as well as the notifications required by the Treaty, shall be passed through the two Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers; one located in Washington, D.C. and the other in Moscow.

Paragraph 3 specifies that no later than 30 days after entry into the force of this Treaty, each party shall provide an update of the data for all categories contained in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Paragraph 4 requires that within 30 days after the first six months of the Treaty, each side will provide updated information for the data categories contained in the Memorandum of Understanding.

Paragraph 5 sets up notification timeframes in the elimination of the INF weapons. Specifically, it calls for a 30-day advance notice for the scheduled elimination of a missile, launcher or support structure, as well as a notification no later than 48 hours after the elimination of one of these items. For those systems that are going to be destroyed by launching, notification must be given ten days in advance.

#### Article X

Article X contains nine paragraphs concerning the notification of the elimination of the various components of INF systems.

Paragraph 1 requires that all eliminations be conducted within the procedures set forth by the Protocol on Elimination.

Paragraph 2 specifies that verification by on-site inspection of the elimination of missile systems shall be carried out in accordance with Article XI of the Treaty and in accordance with the Protocols on Elimination and on Inspection.

Paragraph 3 requires that removal of INF weapons from deployment areas to elimination facilities shall be done in complete deployed organizational units, such as Pershing II batteries, GLCM flights, or SS-20 regiments.

Paragraph 5 permits each party, within the first six months of entry into force of the Treaty, to eliminate by means of launching no more than 100 of its intermediate-range missiles.

Paragraph 6 requires that missile systems tested, but not deployed, prior to entry into force of the Treaty, the Soviet GLCM known as the SSC-X-4 the U.S. Pershing IB (none exist according to the Memorandum of Understanding), must be eliminated within six months after the entry into force of the Treaty.

Paragraph 9 permits the conversion of missile operating bases for use as a base associated with a ballistic missile or a cruise missile not subject to the Treaty. Each party must notify the other within 30 days in advance of the scheduled date and purpose of the conversion of a particular base.

#### Article XI

This article gives each party the right to conduct on-site inspections and specifies that the on-site inspections will be conducted in accordance with this article as well as the Protocol on Inspection and the Protocol on Elimination.

Paragraph 3 requires that 30 days after entry into the force of the Treaty, each party shall have the right to conduct inspections at all facilities designated in the Memorandum of Understanding, other than missile production facilities for the purpose of verifying the data provided in the Memorandum of Understanding and the subsequent update. These inspections shall be completed no later than 90 days after entry into force of the Treaty. (Note: Called

"baseline" inspections by the U.S. Government.)

Paragraph 4 gives each party the right to verify the elimination of missile operating bases and missile support facilities. Such an inspection shall be carried out within 60 days after the scheduled date of the elimination of that facility. (Note: Called "close-out" inspections by the U.S. Government.)

Paragraph 5 gives each party the right of short-notice inspections which are permitted for 13 years. Each party has the right to conduct 20 short-notice inspections per year in the first three years, 15 short-notice inspections per year for the next five years, and 10 short-notice inspections per year for the remaining five years, for a total of 185 short-notice inspections by each side. No more than fifty percent of the short-notice inspections per year can be carried out inside any one basing country. A basing country is defined in Article II as a country other than the U.S. or U.S.S.R. on whose territory INF systems are based subsequent to 1 November 1987. They are Great Britain, Belgium, the Netherlands, West Germany, Italy, East Germany, and Czechoslovakia.

Paragraph 6 provides that for 13 years after the Treaty goes into force, the parties shall have the right to inspect certain missile production installations by means of continuous monitoring. This gives the United States the right to continuously monitor the portals of the Votkinsk machine building plant in the U.S.S.R., the final assembly site of the banned SS-20 and the permitted SS-25 ICBM. The Soviets have stated that the first stage of the SS-25 is outwardly similar to the banned SS-20 missile's first stage. The United States will be able to establish a permanent continuous monitoring system at that facility within six months after entry into force of the Treaty.

The Soviet Union is permitted to establish a continuous monitoring facility at the Hercules Plant #1 in Magna, Utah, which is a former missile production facility for Pershing II missile stages.

The paragraph further specifies that, at the end of the second year after entry into force of the Treaty, if the Soviets have ceased final assembly at Votkinsk of ballistic missiles using a stage outwardly similar to a stage of a missile prohibited by the Treaty (i.e. final assembly of the SS-25) for a period of 12 consecutive months, then unless the assembly is reinitiated, both sides would lose the right to inspect these two facilities by means of continuous monitoring.

Paragraph 7 requires each party to confirm by inspection the elimination of all missiles, launchers, and support equipment by the other party. (Note: Called "elimination" inspections by the U.S. Government.)

Paragraph 8 gives each party the right to inspect the elimination of training missiles and launchers and up to 15 missiles and launchers converted to static displays.

#### Article XII

Article XII specifies that national technical means of verification will be used to monitor the provisions of the Treaty consistent with the generally recognized principles of international law.

Paragraph 2 specifies that neither party shall interfere with the national technical means of verification of the other party or use concealment measures which impede verification of compliance of the provisions of the Treaty.

Because of the similarities in organization between SS-20 and SS-25 regiments, paragraph 3 gives the United States the right to

request the Soviet Union to display, in the open, the missiles and the launchers of an SS-25 operating base no later than six hours after such a request that the missiles and launchers will be displayed in the open for a maximum of twelve hours. The roofs of the missile garages will also be opened. The United States will have the right to make six such requests per calendar year for a period of 3 years after the entry into force of this Treaty unless superseded by a START agreement.

#### Article XIII

This article establishes a *Special Verification Commission* to resolve questions relating to compliance with the obligations assumed and to agree upon such measures as may be necessary to improve the viability and effectiveness of this Treaty. The article also requires that all data exchanges and notifications required by the Treaty be passed through the Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers.

#### Article XIV

The parties shall not assume any international obligations that would conflict with the provisions of the Treaty.

#### Article XV

The article specifies that the Treaty shall be of *unlimited duration*. But, if a party believes that its national sovereignty is in jeopardy because of the Treaty requirements, it can give notice of its decision to withdraw from the Treaty six months prior to that withdrawal.

#### Article XVI

The article permits amendments to the Treaty.

#### Article XVII

The treaty, including the Memorandum of Understanding and the Protocols, shall be subject to ratification in accordance with the constitutional procedures of each party and the Treaty shall enter into force on the date of the exchange of instruments of ratification.

#### MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING REGARDING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE DATA BASE FOR THE TREATY

The Memorandum of Understanding contains the data exchanged current as of 1 November 1987 on intermediate range and shorter range missiles and launchers of such missiles and support structures and support equipment associated with such missiles and launchers. The data contained in this Memorandum of Understanding is to be updated no later than 30 days after entry into force of the Treaty. The updates will be passed through the Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers.

The Memorandum of Understanding contains seven sections:

#### Section I: Definitions

This section contains definitions of the data categories contained in the Memorandum of Understanding. The definitions are applicable to the Treaty and the Protocols as well.

Definitions are given for a missile production facility, missile repair facility, launcher production facility, launcher repair facility, test range, training facility, missile storage facility, launcher storage facility, elimination facility, support equipment, support structure, and research and development site.

## SECTION II: TOTAL NUMBERS OF INTERMEDIATE-RANGE AND SHORTER RANGE MISSILES AND LAUNCHERS OF SUCH MISSILES SUBJECT TO THE TREATY

	U.S.A.	U.S.S.R.
The numbers of intermediate-range missiles and launchers of such missiles for each party are as follows:		
Deployed missiles	429	470
Nondeployed missiles	260	356
Aggregate number of deployed and nondeployed missiles	689	826
Aggregate number of second stages	236	650
Deployed launchers	214	484
Nondeployed launchers	68	124
Aggregate number of deployed and nondeployed launchers	282	608
The numbers of shorter range missiles and launchers of such missiles for each party are as follows:		
Deployed missiles	0	387
Nondeployed missiles	170	539
Aggregate number of deployed and nondeployed missiles	170	926
Aggregate number of second stages	175	726
Deployed launchers	0	197
Nondeployed launchers	1	40
Aggregate number of deployed and nondeployed launchers	1	237

Note.—Aggregated data furnished in the Memorandum of Understanding.

## TOTAL NUMBERS OF MISSILE SYSTEMS TO BE ELIMINATED

	Deployed	Non-deployed	Totals
<b>INTERMEDIATE RANGE</b>			
<b>U.S.S.R.:</b>			
SS-20:			
Missiles	405	245	650
Launchers	405	117	522
SS-4:			
Missiles	65	105	170
Launchers	79	6	85
SS-5:			
Missiles	0	6	6
Launchers	0	0	0
SSC-X-4 (GLCM):			
Missiles	0	84	84
Launchers	0	6	6
<b>U.S.A.:</b>			
Pershing II:			
Missiles	120	127	247
Launchers	115	51	166
BGM-109G (GLCM):			
Missiles	309	133	442
Launchers	99	17	116
<b>SHORTER RANGE</b>			
<b>U.S.S.R.:</b>			
SS-12:			
Missiles	220	506	726
Launchers	115	20	135
SS-23:			
Missiles	167	33	200
Launchers	82	20	102
<b>U.S.A.:</b>			
Pershing IA:			
Missiles	0	170	170
Launchers	0	1	1
Pershing IB:			
Missiles	0	0	0
Launchers	0	0	0

Note.—Memorandum of Understanding does not aggregate data by missile systems. This chart is furnished so that the magnitude of the reductions by missile system can be better comprehended.

## Section III: Intermediate-Range Missiles, Launchers of Such Missiles and Support Structures, and Support Equipment Associated with Such Missiles and Launchers

This is the largest section of the Memorandum of Understanding and lists the intermediate range ballistic missiles and cruise missiles by geographical location, the deployment areas that these missiles operate in after leaving their missile operating bases, the location of the missile operating bases with the numbers of missiles and launchers and support structures and equipment at each missile operating base for the Pershing II, the BGM-109G, the SS-20, the SS-4 and the SS-5.

Paragraph 2 gives the missile support facilities, their locations, and the numbers for each party of all non-deployed intermediate range missiles, launchers, the support structures and the support equipment associated

with the missiles and launchers. Site diagrams for agreed missile support facilities, to include boundaries and center coordinates, were also furnished with the Memorandum of Understanding.

The missiles support facilities are further broken out into missile production facilities, launcher production facilities, missile storage facilities, launcher storage facilities, combined missile/launcher storage facilities, missile repair facilities, launcher repair facilities, combined missile/launcher repair facilities, test ranges, training facilities, elimination facilities, and the final category, missiles, launchers, and support equipment in transient.

## Section IV: Shorter-Range Missiles, Launchers of Such Missiles and Support Equipment Associated with Such Missiles and Launchers

Paragraph 1 lists the deployed missiles broken out by missile operating bases, their geographic locations and the numbers for each party of all deployed shorter-range missiles, launchers and support equipment. Site diagrams, to include boundaries and center coordinates of each listed missile operating base, were furnished with the Memorandum of Understanding.

Paragraph 2 lists missiles support facilities, their locations and the numbers for each party of all non-deployed, shorter-range missiles, their launchers and support equipment. Site diagrams for agreed missile support facilities, to include boundaries and center coordinates, were appended to the Memorandum of Understanding. The data categories contained in this paragraph are identical to the categories for non-deployed intermediate range missiles.

## Section V: Missile Systems Tested but not Deployed Prior to Entry Into Force of the Treaty

This section contains the missile support facilities, their locations and the number for each party of all intermediate range and shorter range missiles and launchers which were tested prior to the entry into force of the Treaty but were never deployed. Therefore, they are not considered existing types of intermediate range or shorter range missiles listed in Article III of the Treaty. The weapons in this category are the U.S. Pershing IB and the SSC-X-4 Soviet Ground-Launched Cruise Missile. Article X of the Treaty requires that these systems be eliminated within six months after entry into force of the Treaty. The Memorandum of Understanding lists zero Pershing IB missiles but does list 84 SSC-X-4 GLCMs along with six launchers.

(NOTE.—In Sections III and IV, one of the categories listed is identification of the elimination facility for each of the weapons to be eliminated. The Soviet Union has designated elimination facilities for all of their missiles in the Memorandum of Understanding. The United States has yet to declare any elimination facilities. According to the Executive Branch, neither party was required to designate elimination facilities during the exchange of data on 1 November 1987 and that the United States will designate elimination facilities at the next exchange of data 30 days after the Treaty goes in force.)

## Section VI: Technical Data

This section contains agreed categories of technical data for missiles and launchers subject to the Treaty, support structures and support equipment associated with the missile systems, and the relevant data for each of these categories. Photographs of

the missiles, launchers, support structures, and support equipment were appended to the Memorandum of Understanding. Technical data consists of measurements in metric system of the size of missiles, launchers and support structures, as well as the weight of the missiles by stages and the number of warheads each system can carry.

## Section VII: Research and Development Booster Systems

This section lists the numbers and locations for each party of the launchers of research and development booster systems that are permitted by Article VII of the Treaty. These research and development launch sites, two located in the Soviet Union and 11 located in the United States and its territories, are not subject to on-site inspections authorized by Article XI of the Treaty.

## Concluding Statement

Each party, in signing the Memorandum of Understanding, acknowledged that it is responsible for the accuracy of only its own data. Signature on the Memorandum of Understanding constitutes acceptance of the categories of data and the inclusion of the data contained therein. The Memorandum of Understanding shall enter into force on the date of the entry into force of the Treaty.

## PROTOCOL ON PROCEDURES GOVERNING THE ELIMINATION OF THE MISSILE SYSTEMS

This Protocol sets up agreed-upon procedures on how to eliminate the missile systems subject to the Treaty.

## I. Items of Missile Systems Subject to Elimination

### (1) For the United States:

Pershing II: missile, launcher and launch pad shelter;

BGM-109G: missiles, launch canister and launcher;

Pershing IA: missiles, and launcher;

Pershing IB: missiles.

### (2) For the U.S.S.R.:

SS-20: missiles, launch canister, launcher, missile transporter vehicle and fixed structure for a launcher;

SS-4: missiles, missile transporter vehicle, missile erector, launcher stand and propellant tanks;

SS-5: missile;

SSC-X-4: missiles, launch canister and launcher;

SS-12: missiles, launcher and missile transporter vehicle;

SS-23: missiles, launcher and missile transporter vehicle.

(3) All training missiles, training missile stages and canisters and launchers shall be subject to elimination.

(4) All stages of intermediate-range and shorter-range ballistic missiles shall be subject to elimination.

(5) All front sections (less the nuclear warhead and guidance system) of deployed intermediate-range and shorter-range missiles shall be subject to elimination.

## II. Procedures for Elimination and Elimination Facilities

The conduct of the elimination procedures shall be subject to on-site inspection in accordance with Article XI of the Treaty and the Protocol on Inspection.

Prior to a missile's arrival at an elimination facility, its nuclear warhead and guidance elements may be removed.

Immediately prior to the initiation of the elimination procedures for a particular missile or component, an inspecting party from



the other side is required to confirm and record the type and number of items of missile systems which are to be eliminated. If the inspecting party deems it necessary, that will include a visual inspection of the contents of launch canisters.

A missile stage being eliminated by burning shall not be instrumented for data collection. Those missile stages shall be subject to continuous observation by an inspecting party until the burning is completed.

The completion of the elimination procedures shall be confirmed in writing by the inspecting party, as well as the party carrying out the elimination.

This Protocol requires that all missiles required to be eliminated within the three-year period shall, in fact, be eliminated 15 days prior to the end of the three-year period. During the last 15 days of the three-year period, the United States will withdraw the nuclear warheads from the West German Pershing I missiles.

Specific procedures for the elimination of the items of missile systems shall be as follows, unless the parties agree upon different procedures to achieve the same result:

#### For the Pershing II:

##### Missile:

(a) Missile stages shall be eliminated by explosive demolition or burning;

(b) Solid fuel, rocket nozzles and motor cases not destroyed in this process should be burned, crushed, flattened or destroyed by explosion; and

(c) Front section, minus nuclear warhead device and guidance elements, shall be crushed or flattened.

##### Launcher:

(a) Erector-launcher mechanism shall be removed from the launcher chassis;

(b) All components of erector-launcher mechanism shall be cut at locations that are not assembly joints into two pieces of approximately equal size;

(c) Missile launch support equipment, including external instrumentation compartment, shall be removed from launcher chassis; and

(d) Launcher chassis shall be cut at a location that is not an assembly joint into two pieces of approximately equal size.

(Note.—Elimination of the Pershing IA, IB, as well as the Soviet ballistic missile systems, both intermediate and shorter-range, are also specified in the Protocol and are essentially similar to the elimination procedures required for the Pershing II.)

#### For the BGM-109G (GLCM):

##### Missile:

(a) Missile airframe should be cut longitudinally into two pieces;

(b) Wings and tail section shall be severed from missile airframe at locations that are not assembly joints;

(c) Front section, minus nuclear warhead devices and guidance elements, shall be crushed or flattened.

##### Launch Canister:

(a) Launch canister shall be crushed, flattened, cut into two pieces of approximately equal size or destroyed by explosion.

##### Launcher:

(a) Erector-launcher mechanism shall be removed from launcher chassis;

(b) All components of erector-launcher mechanism shall be cut at locations that are not assembly joints into two pieces of approximately equal size;

(c) Missile launch support equipment, including external instrumentation compartments, shall be removed from launcher chassis; and

(d) Launcher chassis shall be cut at a location that is not an assembly joint into two pieces of approximately equal size.

(Note.—The destruction procedures for the Soviet GLCM (SSC-X-4) specified in the Protocol are essentially the same as for the BGM-109G.)

Elimination of training missiles, launchers and canisters will be carried out essentially through cutting, crushing or destroying by explosions.

### III. Elimination of Missiles by Means of Launching

Elimination of up to 100 intermediate range missiles by means of launching within the first six months after entry into force of the treaty shall be subject to on-site inspection. Immediately prior to each launch conducted for the purpose of elimination, an inspecting party shall confirm by visual observation the type of missile to be launched.

All missiles being eliminated by means of launching shall be launched from designated elimination facilities to existing impact areas for such missiles. No such missiles shall be used as a target vehicle for a ballistic missile interceptor.

Missiles being eliminated by means of launching shall be launched one at a time and no less than six hours shall elapse between such launches.

Such launches shall involve ignition of all missile stages. Neither party shall transmit or recover data from missiles being eliminated by means of launching except for unencrypted data used for range safety purposes.

### IV. Procedures for Elimination On Site

#### (1) Support Structures.

The elimination of missile systems support structures shall be subject to verification by on-site inspection.

The specific elimination procedures for support structures shall be as follows:

(a) The superstructure of the fixed structure or shelter shall be dismantled or demolished and removed from its base or foundation;

(b) The base or foundation of the fixed structure or shelter shall be destroyed by excavation or explosion;

(c) The destroyed base or foundation of a fixed structure or shelter shall remain visible to National Technical Means of verification for six months or until completion of an on-site inspection.

#### V. Other Types of Elimination

##### (1) Loss or Accidental Destruction.

If an item subject to elimination by this Treaty is lost or destroyed as a result of an accident, the possessing party shall notify the other party within 48 hours that the item has been eliminated. The other party shall have the right to conduct an inspection of the accident to provide confidence that the item has been eliminated.

##### (2) Static Display.

The parties shall have the right to eliminate missiles, launch canisters and launchers as well as training missiles by placing them on static display. Each party shall be limited to a total of 15 missiles, 15 launch canisters and 15 launchers on static display.

Prior to being placed on static display, a missile, launch canister or launcher shall be rendered unusable for purposes inconsistent with the Treaty. Missile propellant shall be removed and erector launcher mechanisms shall be rendered inoperative.

Each party shall have the right to conduct an on-site inspection of each missile launch canister or launcher placed on static display within 60 days of receipt of the notification required.

This Protocol is an integral part of the Treaty and it enters into force on the date of entry into force of the Treaty. As provided for in paragraph 1(b) of Article XIII of the Treaty, the parties may agree upon such measures as may be necessary to improve the viability and effectiveness of this Protocol. Such measures shall not be deemed amendments to the Treaty.

### PROTOCOL REGARDING INSPECTIONS

Following are the key elements of the Protocol Regarding Inspections which sets out procedures governing the conduct of on-site inspections as provided for in Article XI of the Treaty.

#### General Provisions

No later than one day after the entry into force of the Treaty, each party shall provide to the other three lists of personnel. A maximum of 200 individuals can be on each list. One list will be the permanent monitoring parties for the missile facilities in Utah and Votkinsk. Each party will have a 20-day period to determine if the individuals designated for that duty are acceptable to the host country. If they are not, they will be deleted from the list and replaced with personnel acceptable to the host country. The second list will be the names of the personnel conducting the baseline, close-out, short-notice, and elimination inspections. The third list will name the aircrews.

To exercise their functions effectively, inspectors and air crew members shall be accorded diplomatic privileges and immunities throughout the in-country period.

#### Notifications

Notification of an intention to conduct an inspection will be made through the Nuclear Risk Reduction Centers. The receipt of this notification shall be acknowledged back through the Nuclear Risk Reduction Center within one hour of its receipt.

For baseline, close-out, and short-notice inspections, notifications shall be made no less than 16 hours in advance of the estimated time of arrival of the inspection team at a designated point of entry. Included in the notification will be the date and time after arrival that the inspecting party will notify the inspected party where and when it wishes to inspect. Points of entry for the United States are Washington, D.C. and San Francisco; for the Soviet Union, Moscow and Irkutsk. European countries in which INF weapons are based each have one designated point of entry. For elimination inspections, notification shall be made no less than 72 hours in advance of the estimated time of arrival at the point of entry. Included in the notification will be the location of the site to be inspected.

The inspecting party must give notification of where it wants to inspect not sooner than four hours nor later than 24 hours after arrival at the point of entry for close-out or short-notice inspections. Inspecting parties wishing to update data may designate up to 10 facilities they wish to baseline inspect not less than four hours nor more than 48 hours after the arrival at point of entry. It is incumbent upon the inspected country that, once the inspecting party announces where it wants to inspect, to insure that the inspecting party arrives at the site within nine hours.

The inspection team may bring such documents as needed, as well as linear measurement devices, portable weighing devices, radiation detection devices, and other equipment that is mutually agreed upon. The inspecting team may also bring in cameras but

pictures can only be taken at the request of the inspectors by their in-country escort, using the inspecting party's camera system. The camera system must be capable of producing duplicate, instant development photographic prints so that each party shall receive one copy of each photograph.

For baseline, close-out and short-notice inspections, the period of inspection shall not exceed 24 hours per site. This 24 hours begins upon completion of a one-hour pre-inspections procedures briefing at the site. It may be extended by agreement with the in-country escort by no more than eight hours. The duration of an elimination inspection is dependent upon the inspected party's schedule of elimination activity.

Upon conclusion of an inspection, a four-hour period is set aside for the completion of the inspection report. At the completion of the four hours, the team is required to leave the site. It will have 24 hours from the time it arrives at the point of entry to leave the country. For other than short-notice inspection, arrangements can be made to visit more than one site by the inspection team while they are in country.

For baseline, close-out, short-notice and elimination inspections, the size of the inspection team can be no more than 10 inspectors. For an inspection team that is observing elimination through missile firing, the team can have no more than 20 inspectors. And, for the team conducting the permanent portal monitoring at Votkinsk and Magna, Utah, there can be no more than 30 inspectors. On each team, there must be at least two inspectors that can speak the language of the inspected party.

A missile, missile stage, or launcher can only be inspected by external visual observation, including measuring its dimensions. A missile container also can only be inspected by external visual observation, including measuring. A container that is sufficiently large enough to contain more than one missile or missile stage is subject to inspection by means of weighing or visual observation, to include inspection of the interior of the container as necessary.

During the elimination of missiles by launching, the inspectors shall have the right to ascertain by visual observation that the missile prepared for launch is, in fact, a missile of the type subject to elimination.

#### INSPECTION ACTIVITIES AT VOTKINSK AND MAGNA, UTAH

The inspected party shall maintain an agreed perimeter around the periphery of the plant and shall designate a portal with not more than one rail line and one road which shall be within 50 meters of each other. All vehicles which can contain an intermediate-range ballistic missile or the longest stage of such a ballistic missile shall exit only through this portal.

There shall not be more than two other exits from the plant and such exits shall be monitored by appropriate sensors. The inspecting party shall have the right to establish continuous monitoring systems at the portal specified and appropriate sensors at the other exits.

Any shipment exiting through the portal shall be declared by the inspected party to the inspection team before the shipment gets to the portal. The declaration shall state whether such a shipment contains a missile or missile stage as large or larger or as heavy or heavier than an intermediate-range missile or its longest stage. The inspection team shall have the right to weigh and to measure the dimensions of any vehicle, including rail cars exiting the site to as-

certain whether it is large enough and heavy enough to contain a restricted item.

Vehicles exiting through the portal that are large enough and heavy enough to contain a restricted missile item but are not declared to be carrying a restricted missile item, will be subject to inspection by the inspecting party to include the interior of all such vehicles.

The inspecting party shall have the right to weigh and measure the dimensions of any large cannister or of any shipping container declared to contain such missiles or missile stages and to image the contents of any launch cannister or of any shipping container declared to contain a missile or missile stage. It also shall have the right to view such missiles or missile stages in the cannisters or the shipping containers eight times per calendar year.

The inspected party shall furnish all necessary utilities, basic construction materials, site preparation, transportation of equipment, telephone lines, etc. for the inspecting party to construct and operate no more than three buildings with a total floor space of not more than 150 square meters for a data center and an inspection team headquarters. One additional building with floor space of 500 square meters will be built for the storage of supplies and equipment.

This protocol is an integral part of the Treaty. It enters into force on the date of the entry into force of the Treaty. The parties may agree on such measures as may be necessary to prove the viability and effectiveness of this protocol and such measures shall not be deemed amendments to the Treaty.

#### SENATE COMMITTEE MEETINGS

Title IV of Senate Resolution 4, agreed to by the Senate on February 4, 1977, calls for establishment of a system for a computerized schedule of all meetings and hearings of Senate committees, subcommittees, joint committees, and committees of conference. This title requires all such committees to notify the Office of the Senate Daily Digest—designated by the Rules Committee—of the time, place, and purpose of the meetings, when scheduled, and any cancellations or changes in the meetings as they occur.

As an additional procedure along with the computerization of this information, the Office of the Senate Daily Digest will prepare this information for printing in the Extensions of Remarks section of the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD on Monday and Wednesday of each week.

Any changes in committee scheduling will be indicated by placement of an asterisk to the left of the name of the unit conducting such meetings.

Meetings scheduled for Thursday, February 4, 1988, may be found in the Daily Digest of today's RECORD.

#### MEETINGS SCHEDULED

##### FEBRUARY 5

9:30 a.m.

Joint Economic

To hold hearings on employment-unemployment statistics for January.

SD-628

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings to review recent developments in the securities markets, focusing on events surrounding the stock market crash of 1987.

SD-538

Foreign Relations

European Affairs Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the Treaty Between the United States and the Union of Soviet Socialist Republics on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-216

Labor and Human Resources

Labor Subcommittee

To resume hearings to review practices and operations under the National Labor Relations Act.

SD-430

#### FEBRUARY 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation  
Science, Technology, and Space Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on the status of the space shuttle recovery program.

SR-253

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To resume closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

#### FEBRUARY 17

9:00 a.m.

Rules and Administration

Business meeting, to consider Senate committee resolutions requesting funds for operating expenses for 1988, S. Res. 41, to provide for germaneness or relevancy of floor amendments, S. Res. 42, to limit legislative amendments to general appropriations bills, S. Res. 43, to establish a procedure in order to overturn the Chair on questions of germaneness under cloture, S. Res. 274, to limit sense of the Senate or Congress amendments, S. Res. 277, to require that amendments must be offered to a bill, resolution, or other measure in the order of the sections of that bill, resolution, or other measure, and other pending legislative and administrative business.

SR-301

9:30 a.m.

Agriculture, Nutrition, and Forestry

Business meeting, to consider S. 1516, authorizing funds for fiscal years 1988 through 1992 for programs of the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide, and Rodenticide Act (FIFRA).

SR-332

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219



## FEBRUARY 18

10:00 a.m.  
Environment and Public Works  
Environmental Protection Subcommittee  
Superfund and Environmental Oversight Subcommittee  
To hold joint hearings on the implementation of Title I of the Marine Protection, Research, and Sanctuaries Act, including issues related to ocean disposal.

SD-406

2:00 p.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

## FEBRUARY 19

10:00 a.m.

Select on Intelligence

To continue closed hearings on the provisions of the Treaty Between the United States and the USSR on the Elimination of Intermediate-Range and Shorter-Range Missiles (Treaty Doc. 100-11).

SH-219

## FEBRUARY 22

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1989, focusing on the Nuclear Regulatory Commission.

SD-406

Special on Aging

To hold hearings on the Social Security "notch" issue, and possible solutions thereto.

SD-628

2:00 p.m.

Office of Technology Assessment

The Board, to meet to consider pending business items.

EF-100, Capitol

## FEBRUARY 23

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Disabled American Veterans.

SD-106

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee  
To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture.

SD-138

## FEBRUARY 24

9:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Paralyzed Veterans of America, the Blind Veterans Association, the Military Order of the Purple Heart, and the Veterans of World War I.

SR-325

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To hold hearings on the Federal Reserve's first report on the conduct of monetary policy for 1988.

SD-538

2:00 p.m.

Small Business

To hold hearings on S. 1929, to create a corporation for small business investment.

SR-428A

## FEBRUARY 25

8:00 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on the President's proposed budget request for fiscal year 1989 for veterans programs, and proposed legislation relating to veterans' home loan guarantees.

SR-418

10:00 a.m.

Banking, Housing, and Urban Affairs

To continue hearings on the Federal Reserve's first report on the conduct of monetary policy for 1988.

SD-538

## MARCH 1

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Agricultural Research Service, Cooperative State Research Service, and the Extension Service.

SD-138

## MARCH 2

10:00 a.m.

Environment and Public Works

To hold hearings to review those programs which fall within the jurisdiction of the committee as contained in the President's proposed budget for fiscal year 1989, focusing on the Environmental Protection Agency.

SD-406

## MARCH 3

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

Business meeting, to consider President's budget requests for fiscal year 1989 for veterans programs, and proposed legislation relating to veterans' home loan guarantees.

SR-418

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service, Federal Grain Inspection Service, Food Safety and Inspection Service, and the Agricultural Marketing Service.

SD-138

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

To hold hearings on S. 1848, to authorize a Minority Business Development Administration in the Department of Commerce.

SR-253

## MARCH 8

9:30 a.m.

Veterans' Affairs

To hold joint hearings with the House Committee on Veterans' Affairs to review legislative priorities of the Veterans of Foreign Wars.

SD-106

## MARCH 14

10:00 a.m.

Finance

Private Retirement Plans and Oversight of the Internal Revenue Service Subcommittee

To hold hearings on the reform of Internal Revenue Service code penalties.

SD-215

## MARCH 15

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Service, Soil Conservation Service, and the Commodity Credit Corporation.

SD-138

## MARCH 16

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Aviation Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings on activities of the Federal Aviation Administration.

SR-253

## MARCH 22

10:00 a.m.

Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Foreign Agricultural Service, Food for Peace Program (P.L. 480), Office of International Cooperation and Development, and the Office of the General Sales Manager.

SD-138

## MARCH 23

9:30 a.m.

Commerce, Science, and Transportation

Aviation Subcommittee

To resume hearings on S. 1600, to create an independent Federal Aviation Administration.

SR-253

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold oversight hearings to examine how the Federal Government can insure the quality of medical tests performed in clinical laboratories.

SD-342

## MARCH 24

9:30 a.m.

Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To continue oversight hearings to examine how the Federal Government can

insure the quality of medical tests performed in clinical laboratories.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Farm Credit Administration.

SD-138

MARCH 30

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Rural Electrification Administration.

SD-138

MARCH 31

9:00 a.m.

## Veterans' Affairs

To hold hearings on proposed legislation relating to agent orange and related issues.

SR-418

APRIL 12

9:30 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Ethics in Government Act.

SD-342

APRIL 13

9:30 a.m.

## Governmental Affairs

Oversight of Government Management Subcommittee

To continue hearings on proposed legislation authorizing funds for programs of the Ethics in Government Act.

SD-342

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Farmers Home Administration, and the Federal Crop Insurance Corporation.

SD-138

APRIL 19

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, focusing on the Food and Nutrition Service, and the Human Nutrition Information Service.

SD-138

APRIL 21

10:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Commodity Futures Trading Commission, and the Food and Drug Adminis-

tration of the Department of Health and Human Services.

SD-138

APRIL 26

9:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

APRIL 27

9:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138

APRIL 28

9:00 a.m.

## Appropriations

Agriculture, Rural Development and Related Agencies Subcommittee

To hold hearings on proposed budget estimates for fiscal year 1989 for the Department of Agriculture, rural development, and related agencies.

SD-138